DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 759 EC 301 793

AUTHOR	Bunsen, Teresa D., Ed.; And Others
TITLE	Forum on Emerging Trends in Special Education: Implications for Personnel Preparation (4th, Washington, D.C., April 9-10, 1992).
INSTITUTION	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC. Div. of Personnel Preparation.; University of Northern Colorado, Greeley.
PUB DATE	92
CONTRACT	H020K20061
NOTE	224p.; For individual papers, see EC 301 794-803.
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Northern Colorado, Div. of Special Education, McKee Hall, 318, Greeley, CO 80639 ($15).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Alcohol Abuse; Congenital Impairments; *Disabilities; *Drug Abuse; Educational Needs; Educational Practices; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); *Prenatal Influences; Preschool Education; *Special Education; Substance Abuse; *Teacher Education; *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

This compilation of papers resulted from a forum which included professionals from higher education, special education, personnel training, medicine, and related services. The forum attempted to identify current trends in education of children and youth with disabilities and to link these trends to the training of personnel. Topics, originally identified from federal grant applications, fell into two categories: first, school-based practices and second, needs of children and youth affected by drugs and alcohol. Outcomes of discussion on these topics resulted in the following papers: "Focus on Special Education: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow" (James Tucker); "A Look at School-Based Practices from the Local Perspective: Decisions Among Friends vs. The Weenie Factor" (Ned S. Levine); "In-Service Training: School-Based Practice" (M. R. Bryan); "The School as the Center of Educational Reform: Implications of School-Based Practice for Research" (Linda A. Patriarca and Patricia Thomas Cegelka); "Developing Teacher Researchers: Preservice and Inservice Considerations" (Mark A. Koorland); "Philosophy, Differences, and Education" (Diane Baumgart); "A Consultant's Use of Qualitative Methods in Implementing Systems Change: A Snapshot of a Ridgeview High School Program in Special Education" (Diane Baumgart); "Issues in Certification Needs" (Philip R. Jones et al.); "Interventions for Infants Born Affected by Drugs and Alcohol" (Marilyn Krajicek); "Examination of Issues Related to Inservice Programming for Personnel Working with Children Who Are Prenatally Exposed to Drugs and Alcohol" (Lyndal M. Bullock et al.); and "Perspectives on Research in Alcohol and Drug Abuse as It Relates to Special Education and Personnel Preparation" (Robert E. Crow). (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED353759

EC 301793

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MONOGRAPH ON

EMERGING TRENDS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION:

IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING PERSONNEL

Editors

Teresa D. Bunsen
Diane Baumgart
Allen M. Huang

University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado
1992

About the Editors

Teresa D. Bunsen, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor of Special Education at the University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, where she coordinates the graduate teacher preparation program in Behavioral Disorders and Autism.

Diane Baumgart, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor in the Counseling and Special Education Department at the University of Idaho in Moscow, where she coordinates the Master's program in low incidence disabilities and is Project Director on a Federal grant in the area of low incidence disabilities.

Allen M. Huang, Ed.D., is a Professor of Special Education at the University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, where he is the Director of the Division of Special Education.

Papers included in this monograph have been developed based on presentations and discussions at the "Forum on Emerging Trends in Special Education and Implications for Training Personnel" which was jointly sponsored by the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education Programs, Washington, D.C., and the University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado, on April 9-10, 1992.

The points of view expressed in this monograph are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the positions of the U.S. Department of Education or the University of Northern Colorado; no official endorsement should be inferred.

Copies of this monograph may be purchased for $15.00 by writing to the Division of Special Education, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO 80639. (Make checks payable to: Division of Special Education.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
About the Editors	i
Table of Contents	ii
Overview	iv
Teresa D. Bunsen M. Angele Thomas	
Session One: School-Based Practice	1
Statement of Introduction Vance Engleman	2
Focus on Special Education: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow James Tucker	4
A Look at School-Based Practices from the Local Perspective Ned S. Levine	41
Small Group Meetings: School-Based Practice	71
*In-service Training: School-Based Practice M. R. Bryan	72
The School as the Center of Educational Reform: Implications of School-Based Practice for Research Linda A. Patriarca and Patricia Thomas Cegelka	80
Developing Teacher Researchers: Preservice and Inservice Considerations Mark A. Koorland	100
*Perspectives on School-Based Practice Research Needs: Results of a Leadership Forum Group Discussion Diane Baumgart and Gail Bornfield	111
Philosophy, Differences, and Education Diane Baumgart	115

A Consultant's Use of Qualitative Methods in Implementing Systems Change: A Snapshot of a Ridgeview High School Program in Special Education 129
Diane Baumgart

Issues in Certification Needs 154
Philip R. Jones, Lyndal M. Bullock, Judy Smith-Davis, and Robert L. Ash

Session Two: Children Born Affected by Drugs and Alcohol 166

Interventions for Infants Born Affected by Drugs and Alcohol 167
Marilyn Krajicek

Small Group Meetings: Services for Children Born Affected by Drugs and Alcohol 175

*Role of the Special Education Community Relative to Children Born Affected by Drugs and Alcohol 176
A. J. Gail Bornfield

Examination of Issues Related to Inservice Programming for Personnel Working with Children Who are Prenatally Exposed to Drugs and Alcohol 183
Lyndal M. Bullock, Nona Flynn, Jackie Mault, and Lana Svien

Perspectives on Research in Alcohol and Drug Abuse as it Relates to Special Education and Personnel Preparation 195
Robert E. Crow

Participants 206

*Note: Asterisks denote submissions to the monograph which merely summarize the small group discussions.

Introduction

Overview of the Forum

Teresa D. Bunsen
Division of Special Education
University of Northern Colorado

M. Angele Thomas*
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs

This document is the product of the Fourth Annual Forum on Emerging Trends in Special Education and Implications for Personnel Training, which was co-sponsored by the University of Northern Colorado and the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. Dr. Judy Schrag, Director of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) convened the meeting in April, 1992. The professionals who participated attempted to identify the trends in education that are affecting and will continue to affect children and youth with disabilities, birth to 21, over the next several years. The identified trends were then linked to implications for the training of personnel. Segments of the deliberations are reported herein.

The philosophy that provided the impetus for the Forum was succinctly stated by Robert Davila, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), in a Mission Statement issued in February, 1990:

> "In order to enhance opportunities for people with disabilities to achieve their individual potential and maximum participation and productivity in society, the mission of OSERS is to provide effective leadership to improve special education and rehabilitation services through research, innovation and development, training, dissemination, and support of direct services."

This desire to support the field in its efforts to meet the challenges served as the inspiration for the Forum.

The Design of the Forum

The Forum consisted of a four-step process: (a) identifying emerging trends for discussion; (b) formalizing the topics for small group discussions; (c) developing potential strategies for addressing the personnel-training implications of each group; and (d) disseminating formal papers of small group representatives.

Step One in the process was to identify future trends in education that will be affecting individuals involved in training personnel who work with persons with disabilities, birth to 21 years of age. Thus, previous grant applications identified issues considered to be the most critical to their projects and prioritized a list of up to 10 topics. These lists were then reviewed and a matrix of topics was developed. The topics clearly fell into two broad categories: school-based practices and children and youth affected by drugs and alcohol. These were used to structure the Forum discussions.

Step Two involved the formation of small groups in which the aforementioned topics were discussed. During the Forum, one-half of the participants discussed Collaborative Efforts, which encompassed four subtopics: (a) inservice strategies, (b) preservice strategies, (c) research needs, and (d) certification needs. The Children and Youth Affected by Drugs and Alcohol group also divided into four subgroups: (a) role of the special education community, (b) inservice strategies, (c) preservice strategies, and (d) research needs.

The outcomes from these two discussion groups are reported in this monograph. Thus, the responses are from the field of special education and related services. Recommendations are relevant to the field, state education agencies, local education agencies, and the federal government.

Participants in the Forum

There was a deliberate attempt to ensure a representation of Forum participants from a cross-section of disciplines. Thus, in order to facilitate a more comprehensive discussion of the topics, persons with expertise in service delivery and policy formulation were invited to participate along with professionals from higher

education, special education personnel trainers, parents, local school district personnel, medical personnel, and persons from related services (e.g., psychology, therapeutic recreation). Participants represented state education agencies (4%), local education agencies (8%), private non-profit agencies (11%), and institutions of higher education (77%). Of the approximately 75 professionals present, 23% were minority, 11% had disabilities, and 15% were parents of children and youth with disabilities. Each possessed expertise and experiences which enhanced the discussions.

In summary, the issues at the Forum were clearly in concert with the initiatives of OSERS and in sync with the special education profession's challenge at large. Although the various articles only briefly summarize highlights of the small group discussions, they reflect the seriousness with which the participants took their charge.

References*

Bowe, P. (1990). Employment and people with disabilities: Challenges for the nineties. OSERS News in Print III (3), 2-6.

Davila, R. (1990). OSERS Mission Statement and Goals. Washington, D.C.

*This article was written by the author in her private capacity. No official support or endorsement by the Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

Session One:

School-Based Practice

Statement of Introduction

Vance Engleman

"School-Based practice" has emerged as one of the most pivotal and catalytic issues facing the need for educational reform in our schools today. For this reason, this year's "Forum on Emerging Trends in Special Education: Implications for Training Personnel" spent half of its time on this timely topic. What is at stake is defining least restrictive environment as beginning with the neighborhood school and the regular classroom as the first option for serving in the form of appropriate teaching and learning strategies for the student to benefit from the curriculum; plus related services (O.T, P.T., etc.) must come to where the student are instead of the student being "pulled out" to go to some other special setting, or school. While the latter may be administratively convenient, it violates the federal law for the handicapped student to receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE). For "School-Based practice" to work, support in the form of collaborative teams made up of regular and special educators, home school administrators, and parents must become prepared to manage all aspects of the IEP development and implementation within the regular classroom to the maximum extent possible, and utilize other placement options when it is in the best interest of the student within this more normalized and integrated context.

The personnel training needs are obvious. Immediate state-of-the-art inservice training is required nationally for all

educators and parents (who are educators as well!) to reverse the costly trend of excessive pull outs from the mainstream of education, which is the child's neighborhood school. At the same time, major curriculum revisions at the preservice level are required if future educators are going to be effective with the more collaborative support role for teaching children of various needs.

This Forum focused on this issue in two ways: by hearing presentations from two prominent educators, Dr. James Tucker, Director of Special Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Ned Levine, Principal, Anna Henry Elementary School, Tucson, Arizona; plus small group sessions which shared ideas about current obstacles and possible solutions by Forum participants. The summary of all these points of view are in the first part of this monograph.

"School-based practice" is an issue which is under heavy debate at this time with various forms of pilot programs and experiments underway nationally. There is no national consensus at present on how best to make "school-based practice" happen, and viewpoints contained in this document, plus those whose input has yet to surface, are all welcome if this dialogue is to find a meaningful conclusion.

Focus on Special Education: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

James A. Tucker, Director
Bureau of Special Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education

It has been said that if we ignore the mistakes of history, we will be condemned to repeat them. In the wisdom of that philosophy, I would like to group my remarks under three general perspectives:

1. The Ghost of Special Education Past: Why change is needed.
2. The Ghost of Special Education Present: What we now know.
3. The Ghost of Special Education Future: What we intend to do.

I have selected a ghostly metaphor because there seems to be a quality of the unreal that has pervaded the subject of special education from its conception. It means different things to different people. It has appeared and disappeared in an uncanny fashion through the years, and even today, we aren't always sure whether it exists or not.

The Ghost of Special Education Past

ISN'T THAT SPECIAL

An allegorical play in one act

The Setting: You are in a restaurant. It is the only restaurant in town, and there is only one item on the menu. You order that, and you finish it. You are still hungry, so you order more.

Waiter: "I'm sorry, but that's all you can have. It's been determined by the Diet and Food Board that one serving is all that a normal person needs."

You: "But I'm still hungry. Is there nothing you can do?"

Waiter: "There is one option. We have a very small serving room in the basement by the furnace, but it is only for malnourished persons."

You: "Let's say that I'm malnourished, then. Just point me to the basement."

Waiter: "Before you can eat down there, you have to be evaluated by the nourishment examiner to determine if you are truly malnourished. Would you like for me to refer you to the nourishment examiner?"

You: "How long will that take?"

Waiter: "We have only one examiner for this area, and he already has a heavy backlog of cases of suspected

malnourishment. It will be at least two or three weeks before he can see you."

You: "What?! Three weeks?! I'll starve by that time! Isn't it sufficient that I'm hungry now?"

Waiter: "It's the law. The special malnourishment waiter downstairs cannot serve you unless it is verified by a team representing a number of disciplines that you are indeed malnourished."

You: "This is unbelievable! I'm hungry, that's all. What kind of an evaluation can tell you more than that?"

Waiter: "As I understand it, there are any number of reasons why you may appear to be hungry or feel hungry. It is important, for example, to know how your mother fed you when you were young. Also, the examiner will go over all of the foods of the world to get some idea what kinds of foods you may have missed in your life."

You: "Does that mean you have those items on the menu in the basement?"

Waiter: "No. The menu down there is the same as it is up here. The only real difference is that down there the one item on the menu costs twice as much as it does up here."

You: "Let me get this straight. I'm hungry. In order to get anything else to eat, I have to wait three weeks to be evaluated in terms that are irrelevant to either my current hunger or the only existing menu. Then if I am

	deemed sufficiently malnourished by a team of examiners, I will get the same food that you have on this menu, but I will have to pay twice as much for it. Have I left out anything?
Waiter:	"That's about it."
You:	"Why?!"
Waiter:	"It's the law. Wonderful opportunity for the malnourished folks, don't you think?"
You:	"It may be okay for the malnourished, but it doesn't do a thing for the hungry."

With the best of intentions, a number of years ago--back when we were dreaming about what "special education" could be--we ended up with what were euphemistically referred to as unintended results. We ended up in places that we didn't expect to be and wouldn't have gone if we had known we were going to go there.

In 1981, just 10 years ago, a conference was convened at the Wingspread Conference Center in Wisconsin (the first of a series of Wingspread Conferences on special education). The purpose of the initial conference was to discuss what had gone wrong in special education--not wrong in the pejorative sense, but wrong in the sense of why we ended up with unintended results--why, for example, when we went seeking the unserved disabled population of students through programs called "child-find", we ended up with

a huge number of students in a previously unrecognized category called learning disabilities.

Serving as hosts at the conference were three of the world's leading special-education policy-analysts: Maynard Reynolds, John Brandl, and William Copeland. In a keynote address, these three gentlemen presented a report summarizing their review of 15 years of research literature on the general topic of social-service delivery-systems. Their search was motivated by a desire to learn whether or not there might be explanations for what was happening in special education--unintended results in the face of the very best of intentions.

Fifteen years of research in this area has turned up a number of factors that influence how a large service system actually works and why it produces unintended results. A few of these results are suggested as follows:

1. Pre-eminently, service is performed where the money is, regardless of whether the rhetoric says the service should be performed somewhere else.
2. Professionals provide the service they know how to provide regardless of what the recipient of the service may need.
3. When service personnel are faced with the choice of documenting compliance (as a condition of funding) or providing the services defined by the rhetoric of the system, they will document compliance first.
4. When faced with a choice of recipients who are "easy" or "hard" to serve, and formal rewards for dealing with each are equal, the service person will choose to deal with recipients who are easy to serve.
5. If portions--or all--of the service system are seen as a "free lunch", they will attract use, whether the services are needed or not."

January, 1983
Policy Studies Review, Vol. 2, Special No. 1

Overall, the first Wingspread conference was one where most of the energies were spent looking backward. Michael Scriven closed his presentation at the conference with the following words:

> "I cannot say what I think the pessimist could say about our research and our practice in special education at this point, but I think the optimist could say that we have a wonderful opportunity to start all over."
>
> January, 1983
> *Policy Studies Review*, Vol. 2, Special No. 1

And that is exactly what we did. In the 10 years since, we have done a lot of starting over; we have collected a lot of data; we have evaluated the whole concept of special education and what it was, is, and should be. That is good.

We already know many things that should be done. That is not to say that we have all the answers. But in many cases, we aren't implementing what we know NOW. So let's start with what we know. And when we are implementing what we already know that works, we will learn other things that work even better.

And now we are poised on what I believe is to be the most exciting decade of my educational experience, perhaps the educational experience of this century. But let me not get ahead of my story. We aren't quite finished with the ghost of special education past.

I am convinced that we have not carefully considered the basis for some of our traditional practices in special education, and consequently with the best of intentions, we have actually contributed to the problem that we sought to alleviate. Calvin Coolidge had a saying which I adopted as my first law of life:

There is no right way to do the wrong thing.

Please permit me to share what I believe are the two most incidious examples of this from the ghost of special education past.

The Categorical Assumption

We have built special education on the assumption that there are disabling conditions that can be defined precisely and which, when defined, automatically prescribe the services that are needed to accommodate the needs of the students with those conditions. We now know that, with some of the categories, this is wrong. Let me demonstrate the seductive manner in which such an assumption took us down the wrong road.

All of the special education categories can be divided into two groups:

Fact

Theory

Consider the major categories that we use:

Blind and Visually-impaired; is it fact or theory? There is no question; it is a fact. A person's ability to see or not see can be defined precisely, and it can be reliably assessed with virtually no disagreement whatsoever.

Emotionally Disturbed; is it fact or theory? Clearly this is a theory. The category is based on any number of hypothetical sub-conditions that are also theoretical. A student can be defined as emotionally disturbed in one district and not in another. The definition is ambiguous and subject to extensive interpretation.

Deaf and hearing-impaired: is it fact or theory? Again, there is no question; it is a fact. The degree of hearing that a person has or does not have can be measured precisely.

Learning Disabled; is it fact or theory? Given the amount of literature that has been produced over the past thirty years on whether or not this category actually exists, and the resulting lack of conclusion, there is certainly no question that it is an attempt to explain theoretically certain observed behaviors, which are in turn correlates of poor achievement.

Physically-disabled; is it fact or theory? The fact of a physical disability is perhaps the most self-evident of all of the categories. That is not to deny the existence of more mild forms of physically disability which are more difficult to detect, but such forms are still relatively easy to detect because they have a clear physical base of diagnosis that does not require theoretical interpretation.

Mentally Retarded; is it fact or theory? Be careful with this one. If you respond too quickly, you may say "fact", but the concept of mental retardation is now, and always has been, a theory. The fact that many severely "retarded" persons have associated physical anomalies may cause us to think that the category is a fact, when the fact is the physical symptom--not the category.

The categories provided a convenient method of selecting persons for service. When we accepted, as a fact, the theories associated with the categories, we then had a structure within which to build a service-delivery system. For reasons that are buried in the traditions of society, there is a very strong tendency for us to seek to concretize the structures that we create. The mechanism that society has invented to perform this function is called the bureaucracy. This is not an indictment of the bureaucracy, per se, only a description of one of its most vulnerable points. For all of its values, there is a tendency for the bureaucracy to suffer from what someone has called "hardening of the categories"--the condition in which the categories become more important than the people they serve.

I am reminded of Procrustes who, according to Greek mythology, provided lodging for weary travelers. The lodging, along with food and entertainment, was all free. The meals were prepared from the very best food by the very best cooks; the facilities were spacious; everything that could be provided for the comfort of the guests was provided at absolutely no charge. There was only one rule to be eligible for this wonderful service. Every guest had to fit the bed provided. If he was too short, he would be

stretched; if he was too tall, his feet and legs would be cut off to fit. Those that fit the bed enjoyed a most wonderful time and had nothing but praise for the beneficent Procrustes, urging their friends far and wide to stop in and enjoy his gracious hospitality. But many people died in that house, and no one heard of their experience in the same location; for them, the free hospitality was not appropriate.

Categories which are intended to INCLUDE also EXCLUDE, and the temptation is often strong to stretch the individual to fit the category rather than to provide flexibility within a category to meet the needs of an individual.

By successive approximation we have allowed ourselves to be seduced by the labels we have created.

First there was MR theory--then there were MR people who needed special MR treatment. Not enough dollars were available, so we changed the theory and reduced the number of MR people eligible for MR treatment.

Illustration of Fiscal impact on Theory and Practice

But there were still needs, so we created additional labels--MBD/MBI-- with the same result.

Then came LD, with the same result. Then dyslexia, dysgraphia, dyscalculia--a dys-ease approach to service delivery

where treatment of symptoms is more important than addressing the root cause of the symptoms.

Now comes Scotopic sensitivity syndrome, ADD or ADHD, with and without hyperactivity, ad nauseum.

All defining people in terms of external behavioral characteristics which, while they are certainly correlates of school failure, may in fact be the result of other causes, i.e., poor instruction. Boys are by nature more active than girls--we may be tempted to define that extra burst of action as ADHD and then prove that it exists by counting normal behaviors as variant. This then defines an unmet need which justifies the requirement of yet another category of state/federal support.

The end result of the willing self-seduction has been to dilute much-needed resources across a very large and diverse population of students, leaving the system short of the necessary legally mandated and legislatively appropriated funds for disabled students who need "specially designed instruction" BECAUSE of the nature of their disability.

The Standards and Norms Assumption

By the same sort of seductive reasoning that led us down the categorical road, we have built special education on the assumption that there is a diagnostic match between the instructional needs of disabled students and the standardized, norm-referenced tests used to determine their eligibility.

Let me illustrate: As long ago as 1978, the literature contained clear evidence of our mistaken dependence on this assumption.

Grade-equivalent scores obtained by matching specific reading text words to standardized reading test words

Tests	PIAT	MAT	SORT	WRAT
Curricula				
Bank Street Reading				
Grade 1	1.5	1.0	1.8	2.0
Grade 2	2.8	2.5	2.9	2.7
Keys to Reading				
Grade 1	2.0	1.4	2.2	2.2
Grade 2	3.3	1.9	3.0	3.0
Reading 360				
Grade 1	1.5	1.0	1.4	1.7
Grade 2	2.2	2.1	2.7	2.3

Jenkins & Panny (1978)
Exceptional Children

Following the appearance of the above report, there followed a plethora of such studies, all demonstrating the same results: One published in 1980 looked at the relationship between topics covered in textbooks and those covered in the most popular standardized achievement tests.

Percent of tested topics covered in each textbook

	Tests				
Textbooks	MAT	SAT	Iowa	CTBS I	CTBS II
Houghton-Mifflin	60%	51%	63%	57%	58%
Scott-Foresman	71%	52%	66%	57%	68%
Addison-Wesley	60%	47%	53%	54%	61%

This subject was revisited in 1987 by Shapiro and Derr where they reported yet another study with the same conclusions, and summarized the results with the following report:

> Results of this study clearly support Jenkins and Panny's (1978) findings that little overlap exists between the content of standardized reading achievement subtests and basal reading curricula.
>
> A particularly interesting result of the present study is that overlap diminished as grade level increased.
>
> Shapiro & Derr (1987)
> An examination of overlap between reading curricula and standardized achievement tests.
> *The Journal of Special Education*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 59-67

Yet, virtually every state in the United States requires such a measure as a basis for determining the discrepancy between achievement and ability.

What is perhaps more amazing to me, in terms of the manner in which we allowed ourselves to be seduced into using such inappropriate measures, is the fact that the statistical principles underlying these tests and their application have been well-known from the inception of their development decades ago. And all of us who took courses in test-construction and assessment techniques should have recognized the inherent impropriety of using standardized measures to assess the learning of individual students.

A 1978 statement by Dr. Popham, the champion of criterion-referenced measures, puts the subject succinctly into perspective:

> "Test items on which pupils perform particularly well tend to be items covering the very concepts that teachers thought important enough to stress. The more important a topic is, the more likely a teacher is to emphasize it by devoting instructional time to its master. The more instructional time devoted to a topic, the more likely that the...test items related to that topic will be answered by many examinees. The more often a test item is answered correctly, the more likely that, in time, it will be removed from the test. With oft-revised norm-referenced tests, items measuring the most important and the most often taught things tend to be systematically eliminated from the test. What we have left in norm-referenced tests are items that measure unimportant things."
>
> Popham, W. J., 1978
> *Criterion Reference Measures*
> Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Just because a student is deemed to fit the eligibility requirements of a given special education category and an Individualized Educational Plan has been agreed to by all of the required parties, doesn't guarantee the delivery of an appropriate education when the parties involved are unaware of what will work for that student. Research and practice throughout America are replete with examples of promising practices which demonstrate positive effects--practices which, for the most part are NOT being used. It is not necessary to fund further research on what works. We know what works. It is time to do it.

And that brings me to...

The Ghost of Special Education Present

The present status of special education varies considerably, and must be considered as an accumulation of what we have learned and are now able to do as the result. What I am about to cover is certainly not accepted practice everywhere, but every point that I intend to share is solidly based on research and represents the state of the art right now.

To begin a discussion of the present, let us refer again to the law. We have been charged by law to provide a "free and appropriate" education for all disabled students. We have paid great respect to that word "free," but I suggest that we have paid much less attention to the word "appropriate". I intend to divide my remarks relative to the present into these two arenas: cost and appropriateness.

Funding

Virtually every state in the Union is experiencing severe shortages of funds to pay for what they assume to be the fulfillment of the law. I believe that two conditions have precluded the effective and efficient fulfillment of the original intent of the legislation from a fiscal perspective: (1) The Regulations governing the implementation of the law and the built in controls to determine compliance--both at the national level and at the state levels--have been compromised by mixing fiscal concerns with program decisions in the determination of what is appropriate. As a consequence, it has become accepted practice, at least in part due to the fiscal incentives involved to define as exceptional any student experiencing difficulty in school and to

provide approved special-education programs for the education of such a student.

Over time, the number of the "at-risk" types of students being placed into special education programs has grown exponentially until the cost of providing special education far exceeds available funds. Adequate funding is not just important; it is essential. Education costs money, there is no doubt about that, and to provide excellence in education, more money may be needed. But before we can determine whether or not we need MORE MONEY in special education, we must pursue a more responsible evaluation of WHAT IS APPROPRIATE.

The term "appropriate" is often defined as properly filling out the necessary paperwork to assure compliance with the law. Such a definition certainly provides a convenient way to comply with state and federal regulations, but it fails to address the inherent purpose of both the state and federal law requiring a free and appropriate education for the handicapped learner. For one thing, it fails to address the difference between special education that is needed by handicapped students and the special education that is needed by all students at times. A way must be found to provide the APPROPRIATE programs and services needed by identified exceptional students without denying the equally appropriate services needed by those students who are not exceptional.

Where the more severe, physically related handicaps are involved, it is relatively easy to determine the nature of an appropriate education. For example, students with physical disabilities need such assistive devices as electronic

communication aids, braces and wheel chairs; the blind and visually-impaired need such services as training in braille and in orientation-and-mobility; the deaf and hearing-impaired need hearing aids and training in alternative methods of communication. When the disability is physical in nature, the student's needs are self-evident, and the evaluation of our ability to deliver the programs and services to meet those needs is relatively simple.

You might be interested to know that the total number of persons with such needs represents less than one per cent of the population. That is a particularly interesting fact in light of the accompanying fact that we are serving, in special education, an average of 9% to 10% of the population.

When the disability is an emotional, mental, or learning disorder, as it is with the vast majority of students currently receiving special education services, the needs are more difficult to observe and therefore the outcome-based measures of our effectiveness are more difficult as well. It is in these areas that the misappropriation of the special-education program has occurred. The excessive costs being sustained in the name of special education are realized, for the most part, in serving those students who have been inappropriately diagnosed as emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded, and learning disabled. Research supports the hypothesis that most of the students currently represented in these three theoretically defined categories are curriculum casualties--students who are at risk because of inadequate (or inappropriate) instruction) they are NOT disabled students.

> Supplemental or remedial instruction can be equally effective whether provided as compensatory education, special education, or regular education.
>
> A dollar spent on compensatory education may, in fact purchase 25% to 35% more instructional help than the same dollar can purchase in special education where teachers are forced to spend 35% to 50% of their time on paperwork, meetings, and mandatory non-instructional procedures.
>
> Special Commission on Special Education, State of Vermont, January, 1990.

2. Appropriate: Education is APPROPRIATE only if it WORKS. And the degree to which it works must be evaluated by outcome-based measures--not by paper compliance with regulations and standards.

Just because a student is deemed to fit the eligibility requirements of a given special education category and an Individualized Educational Plan has been agreed to by all of the required parties, doesn't guarantee the delivery of an appropriate education when the parties involved are unaware of what will work for that student. Research and practice throughout America are replete with examples of promising practices which demonstrate positive effects--practices which, for the most part are NOT being used. It is not necessary to fund further research on what works. We know what works. It is time to do it.

The most descriptive statement of appropriate education that I have read is one made by Dr. Spady in 1984:

> "Excellence occurs when the instructional system is able to provide the individual learner with an appropriate level of challenge and a realistic opportunity to succeed on a frequent and continual basis for each instructional goal in the program."
>
> William Spady (1984)
> Organizing and delivering curriculum for maximum impact.
> *Making our schools more effective: Proceedings of three state conferences.*

The concept of appropriate, at least within the context of disabilities education, must be dealt with in at least two domains: (a) the quality of instruction provided, and (b) the quality of the location in which instruction is provided. The latter, often referred to as least restrictive environment or LRE, has received the lion's share of the attention, while the former has been more or less left to chance and the level of skill that happens to exist in the selected location.

Here again, we have been seduced into an assumption that illustrates the Calvin Coolidge assertion that "there is no right way to do the wrong thing." A person can be mistreated in the best environments. The quality of service (specially designed instruction, in this case) simply has to be included as an essential ingredient in the mix of issues that we consider when determining the least-restrictive environment.

The term INCLUSION has been receiving a lot of attention lately. While neither the word inclusion nor its predecessor terms,

integration and mainstreaming, appear in federal law, the concept upon which these three terms have been based is firmly established in law. The specific citation in federal law which serves as the basis for these terms is found in Section 300.550 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations. It reads as follows:

"Each public agency shall insure;

(1) That to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities are educated with children who are not handicapped, and

(2) That special classes, separate schooling or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily."

Section 300.550 of Title 34)
Code of Federal Regulations

The mandate is clear, but so are the conditions under which this mandate is to be carried out. Here again, the word "appropriate" figures prominently, and the necessity for "supplementary aids" cannot be overlooked. No student currently receiving special education should be "dumped" into regular education classes just because someone has heard about a concept called "integration" or "inclusion."

So let us look at the quality of instruction that is required under law. A fact that is very often overlooked is the very definition of "special education" in federal law:

> The term "special education" means specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents or guardians, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability.
>
> Section 1401(a)(16)
> Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

Instruction is the single most powerful element in determining the appropriateness of a program for disabled learners, and yet, it is often the least-considered element, in favor of more mundane issues like eligibility, available space, class size restrictions, cost, pressure to move a given student, and the like. Why is that?

Could it be that even with the great amount of time and energy that we spend on the improvement of our instructional capability, we may be accidentally ignoring some very basic facts about our system? Return with me for a moment to the discussion of standards and norms and think of that subject as it relates to the variance of students in a classroom. To make this point, I will draw from a book by my friend, Dr. Charles Hargis of the University

of Tennessee. He is referring to the normal student variance that occurs in a classroom:

"How much variation within the manufacturing process can be managed before defects appear? In manufacturing things, tolerances need be, and can be, kept quite small. If the items being assembled are all within tolerance, the manufacturing process goes smoothly and the resultant product performs appropriately.

We can control the tolerance measures much better for them than we can for humans. Tolerance limits must be viewed very differently when humans rather than machined parts are concerned.

Most people fit adequately within the tolerance levels of most standardized items (e.g., the height of doorways, the length of beds). However, a significant number don't and they may well experience the inconvenience or discomfort of being out of tolerance on some dimension.

No one has ever suggested, to my knowledge, that if people don't fit the standard, the people be altered in some way so they do. However, it seems quite clear that we expect to alter children to fit the standards by school curricula.

As it turns out, the students are remarkably variable and the schools have rather limited tolerance. . . . schools have, at the primary level, tolerance limits of about ± six months (Spache, 1976)*."

Hargis, C. H. (1989)
Teaching low achieving and disadvantaged students.
Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, Springfield, Ill.

*Spache, G. D. (1976)
Investigating the issues of reading disabilities.
Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Now, let us apply the Spache findings to our typical school situation where a student who experiences difficulty might be referred for a multidisciplinary evaluation because of a suspected disability. Consider the normal variance between high-achieving and slow-achieving students. To make this point even more obvious, let us assume that the limits of "normal" can be indicated by measured intelligence, an assumption that we know does not hold up, but it will serve for this illustration. Further, let us assume the most conservative limits possible--a range from IQ 80 to IQ 120. In most states, the range is from IQ 70 to IQ 130, but we want to be on the safe side in this illustration.

So we have a range of normal variance that would be accepted in virtually any system of education in the nation--IQ 80 to IQ 120. For the purposes of this discussion, we will allow that anyone with measured IQ above or below this range is exceptional, but that within this range, the learner has normal intelligence. Measured intelligence is, of course, based on a measure of mental age compared to chronological age.

Take age 6--the age at which most children enter first grade.

IQ 80 = mental age of 4.8 years.

IQ 120 = mental age of 7.2 years.

The NORMAL variance in the measured intelligence of a homogeneous group of first graders is 2.4 years, or about 29 months (± 14.45 months)--MORE THAN TWO TIMES THE LIMIT OF TOLERANCE.

> And that variance increases by .2 year upward and .2 year downward each year.
>
> By the fourth grade, for example, the normal variance in measured intelligence of a homogeneous group is:
>
> IQ 80 = mental age of 7.2 years.
>
> IQ 120 = mental age of 10.8 years.
>
> The NORMAL variance in the measured intelligence of a homogeneous group of fourth graders is 43.2 months (± 21.6 months)--MORE THAN THREE TIMES THE LIMIT OF TOLERANCE.

It is interesting to note that it is at the third and fourth grades that we experience the most dramatic influx into special education.

And, please, don't forget that this illustration was based on a most conservative definition of normal. The "real" variance in a "normal" group of primary grade students is much greater because of the naturally varying conditions of the environment and the fact that the students in a given classroom range in chronological age by up to 12 months or more.

The point, of course, is that our rhetoric is often based on one belief system, while our practice is based on another. We talk about a theory of normal that includes a broad range of students, but when the tolerance of our system cannot accommodate that range, we have to create alternative systems that will. It is my considered belief that special

education, along with Chapter I, and other "special" treatment programs, accomplish them.

A few years back, Dr. Jay Samuels of the University of Minnesota, was asked by the National Institute of Education to interview the staff members of U.S. Congressional Education Committees to determine what had been the intent of Congress when it passed the Basic Skills Act--just what did Congress mean by "basic skills." It was not at all surprising that there was wide divergence in what was viewed as basic skills, but in 1984 Samuels reported that, generally, the skills fell out in the five traditional categories of reading, writing, mathematics, speaking, and listening. Relating to the first three of these as "human inventions which are found only in literate societies," Samuels makes the following remarkable statement:

> "Even modest IQ levels, within the 50-70 range of educable retardation, seem to be sufficient for mastering the basic skills which originate through human invention. Why then, one wonders, if the basic skills can be acquired with IQs in the 50-70 range, are there so many children who fail to master them despite having levels of intelligence substantially higher?"
>
> Samuels, S. Jay (1984)
> Basic academic skills
> *School psychology: The state of the art*
> Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota

Why, indeed?

Dr. Samuels goes on to answer his own question by asserting that the problem is one of expectation, motivation,

and instruction. It is not safe to make categorical statements of simple solutions to complex problems, but generally speaking, Samuels offers three things that teachers can do to help students master the basic skills:

> "In many ways, good athletic coaching and good classroom teaching have much in common, and principles of coaching applied to the classroom can help students master the basic skills.
>
> In essence, to master the basic skills either in sports or the classroom, three elements are necessary:
>
> 1. Motivate the student.
>
> 2. Bring the student to the level of accuracy in the skill, and
>
> 3. Provide the practice necessary for the skill to become automatic."
>
> Samuels, S. Jay (1984)
> Basic academic skills
> *School psychology: The state of the art*
> Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota

Essentially: motivate, teach to mastery, and practice until it is automatic.

Let's briefly discuss what we know about these three principles--in practical terms. For reasons that will become clear later, I will hold the discussion of "motivation" until last.

Teach to Mastery

"Mastery" is so well understood that it hardly deserves mention here except to make one point. The term can be defined (or defiled) by bureaucratic interpretation to mean something that it is not! For example, it is becoming quite commonplace to hear statements like, "70% mastery" is a criterion for success. That is like saying that someone is 70% dead! Such misuse of a very effective term certainly limits its usefulness. "Mastery" means precisely that--mastery! Nothing short of 100% is mastery. A bridge reaching 70% across a chasm is a bridge to nowhere!

"Mastery" is one of the foundation principles of individualized instruction. Goals and objectives are written in terms of facts, concepts, and instructional units to be mastered. Unless the basic content to be learned is clearly understood (mastered), it is meaningless to practice it until it becomes automatic.

Practice Until the Skill Becomes Automatic

You have heard the term "practice makes perfect." Actually, as you all know, practice makes permanent. Only perfect practice makes perfect. Homework, for example, should be practice--not mastery. If a student takes work home that has not been mastered, that student is destined to reinforce his or her lack of understanding, which often translates into "get someone else to do it."

But, let me over-simplify an instructional principle that has been known since the 1930s when Dr. Gates reported the results of his research on the role of repetition in learning:

> In order for a fact or a concept to become automatic (readily available in a long-term memory), a measured number of repetitions are necessary, depending on the ability level of the learner:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | "High" ability (IQ 120) | 25 repetitions |
> | "Average" Ability (IQ 100) | 35 repetitions |
> | "Slow" Ability (IQ 80) | 55 repetitions |
>
> Gates, A. I. (1930)
> *Interest and ability in reading*
> New York: Macmillan

Motivate the Student

Here is where, in the last decade, we discovered pure instructional gold. What I am about to share with you is the single most powerful motivational technique of instruction that I have ever seen. The concept was actually described first by Dr. Betts of Temple University in 1957. But, the concept lay dormant for most of 20 years before it received wide instructional application in America: "Independent Level (97-100% known material); Instructional Level (93-96% known material); and Frustrational Level (less than 93% known material)" (Betts, 1957, in Gickling & Thompson, 1985).

It was Dr. Ed Gickling, then of the University of Tennessee, who applied the Betts concept to classroom instruction on a broad

scale. His classic study, published in 1978, is perhaps still the best illustration of the motivational aspects of appropriate instruction.

Motivation

Motivation is a natural learning state that exists between frustration and boredom in which the inclination to learn is intrinsic to the learner, not induced by external state. Another study, also done by Gickling and his associates, illustrates a timely fact. The issue of Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) is not going to go away until we can demonstrate that the problem is one of instructional relevance rather than of dealing with a disability.

The Ghost of Special Education Future

The future is evolutionary. Our best thoughts of today will be altered, in most cases, significantly by events as they unfold. But, as John Scully has said, "The best way to predict the future is to invent it." If you believe that, and I do, then you have to accept that the future is NOW!

It also occurs to me that we could take John Scully's statement and turn it around. What we have learned about the power of suggestion-and-expectation theory leads me to conclude that one of the best ways to invent the future is to predict it. Obviously, there is more to the future than current predictions. Recently, I had the occasion to review some delphi research in which I participated in the mid-1970's. The research was conducted by leading delphi technologists of that time. It was interesting to note that what we predicted in 1975 as happening

over the subsequent 5, 10, and 15 years has, in most cases, not happened. Furthermore, the values upon which those predictions were based have altered significantly. So, predictions in isolation do not invent the future; but predictions based on expectations that are, in turn, based on strongly held beliefs that are supported by real data translate into action that does invent the future.

The world stands on the threshold of its greatest challenge to date--survival in a technological society where the destructive forces seem to be increasing faster than our ability to find solutions to them. Our need to provide for the fundamental needs of exceptional children is only one of the many issues that have to be resolved, but it is a worthy one. The challenge before us in that arena alone is a complex one: We will have to proceed on a number of fronts simultaneously. There is no linear path that can be taken at this time. We must provide a number of BOLD NEW STROKES that will take us into the 21st Century. To that end, I offer the following five inventions of the future. The five can be divided into two general categories--Free and Appropriate.

Free

Funding

The word "free" in the law means adequate funding. It is only free to the parents or guardians in terms of any individually assessed "value-added tax." IT is not free in the general sense of a charge against the public tax base. So, we have to address the cost of an appropriate education for disabled students, and we have to provide for that in realistic terms.

To begin with, we must build flexibility into our current funding systems. We can fund results rather than ADMs, contact hours, and head counts. We can worry less about whether special education funds are being diverted to purchase football helmets because, when the outcomes are clearly specified, such issues are less important. It occurs to me, however, that football helmets may be one of the best and most effective pre-referral strategies in the prevention of traumatic brain injury.

The only way to protect against the fiscal abuses that are rampant in the nation is to cleanly separate the funding from the categorical assumption. We now have two decades of data that tell us how many disabled students there are. We can build an adequate funding base on this data, and we can get away from such artificial and inappropriate funding concepts as the "child count." At least one state has already done this; several others are considering such a change, and we are encouraging the Federal Government to follow suit. This change, in part, depends on a change in the definition of "special education."

Change "Special Education" to "Disabilities Education

We must begin immediately to explore ways of getting away from the term "special" education as a descriptor of what we are all about. Every person in the world needs an education that is special--specially designed to meet his or her specific needs. By the unfortunate act of history, we have conceptually limited special consideration of the individual student to handicapped persons.

There is nothing inherently "special" about reducing the student-teacher ratio--even to a one-to-one ratio. All students occasionally need a very low student-teacher ratio; e.g., driver education, music lessons, detention, and even academic assistance after school. Being a "slow" student who is unable to keep up with the "rest of the class" when the pace is set to a norm that is unnaturally high for that student doesn't make either the student "handicapped" or the tutoring that s/he needs "special education" if the nature of the intervention is the same, but slower. Neither is routine instruction at a lower student-teacher ratio in and of itself "special," it is only more intensive.

We will have to more specifically define what we have traditionally called "special education." I offer one such definition for your consideration, and I will use the term "disabilities education." It is descriptive, it is consistent with the full range of national legislation relating to the needs of children and youth with disabilities:

Disabilities Education--specially designed instruction, where the actual techniques are impairment-specific and require special training to deliver.

(e.g., training in the use of assistive devices, orientation and mobility training, braille training, physical therapy, and occupational therapy.

Appropriate

Coordination of Legislative Mandates

We must have effective coordination and implementation of existing legislation. For example, there is a dynamic interface between the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)--P.L. 101-476 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. The former provides for specially designed instruction; the latter, reasonable accommodation for such basic rights as access to the school environment. The two are often confused, and the endless debate over which rules apply often takes our efforts away from implementing the very services that both acts demand. One of the primary reasons for such debate is the fact that the Section 504 guarantees are not tied to restrictions of funding or governance, thus emphasizing outcomes instead of eligibility. On the other hand, legislation such as P.L.s 89-313, 94-142, 99-457, and 101-476 carry extensive limits involving funding and governance, thus emphasizing eligibility instead of outcomes.

Change Paper Compliance to an Outcomes-Based Process

Last year at a meeting in Washington, D.C., we heard David Hornbeck call for protecting students via outcomes rather than wrapping them in regulations. The term "appropriate education" must be defined, as required by law, in terms of the individual student's need for specially designed instruction, using the word "instruction" to apply to all of the specific educational needs of each student.

Fundamental to such a definition is a dramatic shift in the forms of assessment that we practice. We waste an inordinate amount of time and resources on determining a student's eligibility for special education without assessing the instructional needs of the student. The recent study conducted by Decision Resources Group concluded that we spend in excess of $1270 per student just in the eligibility determination. And after we have spent that amount of money, we still place students into inappropriate instructional settings where they are as likely to fail as they were before they were referred.

We have been beset with regulations that require documented evidence of "planning," so much so that the plans themselves become the end instead of a means to an end. You have your IFSPs, your IEPs, your ITPs, and your IWRPs and, as a result, what do you get? A lot older, and deeper in debt.

There is no reason whatsoever for all of those different planning documents. We should have plans, and they should be developed jointly by all of the appropriate participants, but there should only be ONE PLAN! We need one plan that represents the integration of all needed services from birth to successful achievement of post-secondary outcomes. Call it what you wish: I call it an ISP--Individual Service Plan--but you could just as easily call it an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP).

Educational services provided for disabled students must be evaluated in terms of outcome-based measures rather than by achieving some artificial norm-referenced objective from a computer-generated bank of objectives.

Ultimately, the success of what we do will be determined by whether or not students learn more and are more successful, whether more high school graduates are employed and/or go on to college. The results will speak for themselves.

A System that is Parent-Focused, Community-Based, and Collaborative

Finally, and I think perhaps the most important of all--all elements of society working together. We must realize the potent value of parents and the community in providing for the educational needs of all children and youth, including the disabled learners. And, we absolutely have to develop the skills necessary to work together on behalf of the education of **all** members of the next generation.

In the future we will see dramatic changes in the way that educational delivery systems are structured and in the way that educational services are delivered. For example, we will see:

- Neighborhood schools as community learning centers--for learners of ALL ages.

- One-stop learning-support which includes: information, referral, and follow-up; comprehensive health care services; multi-agency responsibility.

- Graduated learning options, which are outcomes based.

- Lifelong learning opportunities (career ladders) for ALL learners.

- Educational programs which treat diversity as a strength: multicultural exploration and celebration; instructional accommodation to the natural variance of ALL learners.

- Integrated vocational education for ALL learners of ALL ages: educational "leave" without age limit.

- School districts as integrated systems of higher education: mentorships, apprenticeships, career ladders based on professional achievement.

We must become acutely aware of the many human resources that come to bear on the lives of children and youth. It is extremely important that we participate in aggressive networking. I propose for your consideration the Darth Vader model of networking: 17 linkages which are vitally important, any one of which, if ignored, weakens our program.

What is the Overriding Goal to be Achieved?

The goal is really very simple--every student who needs special assistance in order to succeed in school will have it readily available when and where it is needed. The goal is eminently achievable. We are not talking about luxury, but rather about a basic necessity for the survival of civil and personal freedoms.

There is also the question of funding; there are those who believe that more money somehow translates into better, or at least not worse, services. While it is true that sufficient funds are needed, and in some instances more funds are needed, the results achieved within a number of the models of promising

practices have demonstrated that good education can, at least in some instances, cost LESS than poor education. And in the larger societal context, good education absolutely costs less than poor education.

Let us not be blinded by existing ideas of funding or service delivery. Let us be as creative as necessary to provide what is needed. We may be surprised to find out that, while the cost is great, the mission is sufficiently worthy to rally the resources necessary to accomplish it. The United States is still the most highly endowed nation on earth. It is inconceivable that a nation that can place a man on the moon will not teach its children to read.

How Long Will it Take to Reach this Goal?

It will take us from 5 to 20 years, depending on how we work together to provide the necessary program and fiscal supports that will be required. One of our chief faults as a modern society is that we tend to think AND ACT within the confines of political terms of office. All of the research that we have to date on how program change occurs tells us that such change takes more years than are available within a typical governmental term of office. Our efforts must, therefore, transcend the political realities that exist and provide for the needed consistency of policy and resources over time to see us through.

I repeat. We know HOW to achieve the goal. We have the technology and the resources to achieve the goal. All that remains now is to get to work.

A Look at School-Based Practices from the Local Perspective: Decisions Among Friends vs. The Weenie Factor

Ned S. Levine

On Doing Less and Being More

Your job is to facilitate and illuminate what is happening. Interfere as little as possible. Interference, however brilliant, creates a dependency on the leader.

The fewer the rules the better. Rules reduce freedom and responsibility. Enforcement of rules is coercive and manipulative, which diminishes spontaneity and absorbs group energy.

The more coercive you are, the more resistant the groups will become. Your manipulations will only be evasions. Every law creates an outlaw. This is no way to run a group.

The wise leader establishes a clear and wholesome climate in the group room. In light of awareness, the group naturally acts in a wholesome manner.

When the leader practices silence, the group remains focused. When the leader does not impose rules, the group discovers its own goodness. When the leader acts unselfishly, the group simply does what is to be done.

Good leadership consists of doing less and being more.

The Tao of Leadership, John Heider, p. 113

It is a pleasure and honor to be addressing you here today. You are the powerful people, the people with information and insight, knowledge and an understanding of what should be and could be done to improve services for children in our nations' schools today. We have a wonderful opportunity to share our knowledge and skills with each other these two days. We have the opportunity to make commitments to each other to share of ourselves beyond this time and beyond these wells as well.

I sincerely hope that you will consider extending your work beyond this conference.... we are faced with a difficult task. You know it. I know it. We have before us in our schools children whose lives have been damaged, some permanently, as a result of the behavior of their parents. It is sad, almost tragic, that some of the damage to these children is entirely preventable; inherited as it were from a parent in a diseased state, a parent whose life has been so effected by drug involvement that they cannot understand how their own abuse is visited upon their children.

My purpose for speaking with you this afternoon is to share how we create a site based response to the changing special population in schools, to share with you the process stages local site groups should go through to create responsive programs for special needs children.

I am presently a principal of a pre-K to grade 5 school in Tucson, Arizona. My school includes a special education pre-school program and a Cross-Categorical Service model for grades K-5. The cross-categorical students include trainable mentally handicapped, educable mentally handicapped, learning disabled,

multiply handicapped, severe language students.... all of whom receive services through totally integrated programs in the regular education classroom. For the past five years, we have also served children who were prenatally exposed to drugs or alcohol. In addition, I have a student who is HIV positive in our building.

Our problems are not unique. Our responses to our problems are:

Down Syndrome - total inclusion with assistance
HIV-positive-total inclusion with assistance
Cross-categorical services model
Collaborative delivery systems
Kids stay in regular education class - teachers travel (consultative model)

We have a school Intervention Team, whose purpose is to identify high risk students, provide direct services to those children and serve as resource for their parents and their teachers. We also have established a Child Advocate program- support and intervention services for special needs children with both intellectual and emotional problems. We have no psychologist, counselor or social worker who sees student for other than special education placement purposes. With the exception of the CCS teacher, all other services described are done without additional school monies. We do take donations of time and expertise, however, and use them extensively.

Some of these students qualify for special education services, some do not. However, we are working with every child in some

way. We do this as a team. We do this because we should. We do this because we have agreed that it is best for the children.

How did we get there? Did we do it because it was mandated?

Well it wasn't easy, it wasn't without disagreement, sacrifice and pain.... but what change is?

It was accomplished with forethought. We did not arrive at these decisions overnight, nor through law, edict, directive or policy. We arrived at our program through a managed process which some refer to as site-based decision making. The process itself is really human management -- management of concerns, worries, needs and wants.

The changes themselves are really changes in attitudes made possible by careful facilitation. You are here to attend a leadership conference. As leaders, the burden falls to you to create the climate which not only allows attitude to change, but may even require it.

The problems you face will be problems of a human nature more than anything else. There will be Problems which other people will translate into obstacles or barriers to your attempted change. Not surprisingly, your behavior in response as a change agent should CHANGE with each of the real or imagined barriers people present.

Leaders can best assist change by using facilitative skills, those which help to assign tasks, define roles, teach interpersonal skills, observe and provide feedback on behaviors helpful to the success of the task. Leaders also have executive functions to provide as well, functions such as logistics and evaluation of

progress. The latter come more naturally to us, as they are the perceived functions of our positions. It is those other things, those people development skills, that are truly tantamount to your change for success.

Change will take new knowledge, new attitudes, new behaviors... and new will. You can help. You can be the leaders we need.

As a training director for school team trainings under the Drug Free Schools Act, with the Governor's office in Arizona, and with other school districts and companies, I have arrived at the conclusion that the best thing that each of you could do for us in the schools, and perhaps the most important thing to know, is to share your expertise with an open mind and demonstrate a willingness to assist a building-based decision-making team to help implement and design programs for students.

Pressures for Change in Educational Decision-Making

In recent years there has been a plethora of commission studies and national initiatives directed at the public school system. There is an insistent demand for greater accountability in response to a stagnating or declining rate of achievement among the participants of our public education system. Business and government want efficient, effective delivery of services and more teacher accountability. Reform reports directed public attention to education, but their initial change recommendations (such as career ladders) have not been implemented widely, and where implemented haven't brought concrete improvements.

New requirements for certification of teachers, core curriculums, graduation standards, pay systems and even instructional procedures are being imposed upon schools in a top-down, mandated, state-wide reform effort in the name of improvement. The competitive crises for human resources and changing needs of society are strong external forces for change. Within the educational system itself, employees are looking for a new way to address persistent, unresolved problems.

A "national agenda for education" is on the horizon. Politically motivated, few see the governors' and president's goal-setting as real guidance or support for revitalizing our schools. Similar to the "weenie syndrome" described by Sirotnik and Clark (1988), the national agenda approach will translate into re-election posturing. In the weenie syndrome, the elite assume that the mass of people are empty of understanding and need to be stuffed with relevant instructions. People increasingly distrust decisions made by elite groups of leaders. Site based management is a move way from this approach towards true participatory leadership.

While we wallow in this manner, American industry is attempting to dismantle its own bureaucratic structure to achieve true participatory management to emulate the successful systems of those countries and business that are excelling worldwide. The public sector is beginning to realize that the environment in which the business of doing business occurs is a social structure to be reckoned with. It is not stagnant; it is an open economic and political environments. Organizations as small as delivery or manufacturing departments develop cultures of their own,

complete with norms, expectations, roles, rituals and ceremonies and celebrations. Organizations and the people in them interact in much more complex ways than previously imagined. It is impossible to create a set of standard rules of management which will apply to every sub-structure of an organization. We need to move away from centralized management.

The RAND Corporation studies (reported by Berman and McLaughlin, 1978) of nearly 440 federally funded projects for educational innovations concluded that true innovations have a better chance of surviving and thriving when conducted in a collaborative manner within the local structure. Activities such as observation of the innovative practice in other settings by practitioners (teachers observing teachers), regular meetings that focus on solving practical problems of implementation, teacher participation in decision making, local development of materials, and leader (principal) participation in training produced the best results.

Innovations and improvements are best fostered and maintained in the local environment through a collaborative process. Mutual support and reinforcement, synergy, collective action and supplementary expertise are derived from collaborative environments (Pareek, 1981). When people work together in a group or team, their commitment to a goal is likely to be high and their courage to stand by a goal and take the necessary action to implement it is much higher. Additionally, they are more willing to establish superordinate goals for the benefit of the institution (Sherif and Sherif, 1953).

In reality, the centralized bureaucratic structure as perceived on paper never functioned in practice anyway. If we are to truly change our schools as well as our businesses, we must adopt a different paradigm for our existence.

What is Site-Based Decision-Making?

Site-based decision-making, or site-based management, is a joint planning and problem solving process that seeks to improve the quality of the working conditions and the education delivery to students. There is an implied sharing of power, authority and responsibility. It is a continuing, open-ended process. It is proactive and future oriented.

Leadership is management of the future. We certainly don't need leaders to ignore the past, just look back at it and reflect upon how we arrived at our successes or failures. We need leaders who know how to get us past the present and into the future.

Planning is an attempt at goal driven improvement. In order for it to have a chance to succeed, the plan must become the compelling mission of the organization. It becomes the leader's task to help define where an individual's goals and the organization's goals overlap. A leader must help define the area where an individual's own sense of purpose and motivation for doing their job overlaps with his/her role within the system and must value that match.

How leadership is employed should be dependent upon an analysis of the gestalt of the social, political and economic environment. Strategic planning is a process leaders choose to

employ, either at the central level for applications to many substructures or at the particular sub-levels through management groups stationed there. The planning process itself includes traditional phases such as:

Planning to Plan

External (Environmental Scanning) Analysis

Internal Analysis (Current Status of Performance)

Organizational Analysis

Developing or Refining a Mission Focus

Specific Plan of Action for Improvement

The importance of developing and training personnel in a decision-making process cannot be overemphasized. Before and during implementation, employees need to be trained in:

- Communication skills
- Team Building
- Consensus development
- Group decision-making models
- Conflict resolution
- Running an effective meeting
- Evaluation techniques

Just because people work together in the same environment does not mean that they will know how to plan for change together. Teaching is a solitary act, with thousands of decisions made in the sanctuary of the classroom. The success of most innovations, such as site-based decision making, is dependent on the quantity and quality of staff development of these skills (Rallis, 1988; Lieberman, 1988; Brookover, 1982).

School-based management is based on a number of common beliefs about social systems:

- Individuals responsible for implementing decisions should have a voice in determining those decisions
- Decisions should be made at the lowest possible level
- Teachers can and should play an important role in making decisions that affect the children they teach
- Parents and community members have an important role in shaping the education of the community's children
- School-Based management can help schools make the most effective use of limited resources to deal with the educational needs of the students they serve
- Change is most likely to be effective when those who carry out the change feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for the process

Two conditions must exist simultaneously before site-based decision-making can become a reality. First, *participants* must be willing to devote the time and energy that leadership requires, and must be willing to be held responsible for the implications of assumed *authority*. Second, *policy makers* and administrators must establish the structures for such involvement and send a clear message that staff may undertake such an activity.

Potential Benefits and Risks

Why would a school system want to involve employees in school-based decision making? *School-Based Management*, published by the American Association of School Administrators, offers the following reasons:

- Improves moral of teachers
- Shifts emphasis in staff development
- Focuses accountability for decisions
- Brings both financial and instructional resources in line with the school's instructional goals
- Provides better service and programs to students
- Nurtures and stimulates leaders
- Increases both the quantity and quality of communication
- Effective programs are more likely to be shared quickly
- Staff, parents and students feel a greater ownership

In addition, it has been my experience that a Process such as site-based decision making is flexible and can be designed to fit unique local or site needs.

It also means that you must wrestle with such dilemmas as:

- Additional time required to participate in decisions
- Additional time required to arrive at decisions
- The "Tyranny of the Majority", should consensus not be employed
- Voluntary versus mandatory participation of staff
- Requesting variations in contracted agreements or district policies to attempt creative solutions
- Additional resources for process training

- Additional resources needed to operate SBM group
- Assess short term versus long-term effects of resolutions
- Dealing with the perception of power elitism
- Dealing with failure
- Monitoring ongoing programmatic changes
- Maintaining desired improvement

Restructuring to accomplish a change in paradigm must begin in the classroom with a change in each individual interaction with children. It should be no surprise that we must deal with the whole child in order to be able to deal with the academic and social development schools were designed for.

At best, top down directives do little more than create a focus for efforts at real improvement and changes. Often they create an animosity towards or serve as an excuse mechanism for the proposed changes.

To be effective, change must be a shared endeavor, championed by strong leadership, supported through long-range planning, comprehensive assessment, and short-range adjustments to the plans.

Change occurs with people first, then institutions. To insure lasting change, basic knowledge, skills and values must be examined and altered. Engagement, motivation and communication are key to making these things happen.

Merely moving to a different decision making model without a paradigm shift in our role as an institution in America will probably insure failure.

Is the purpose of moving to a decision-making model such as site-based management to become more efficient at how we conduct our present-day business? If so, I predict that we will become disenchanted with this approach as we have with so many others. We will merely further propel ourselves along the path of unsuccessful improvement if we see the schools as the target of change. It is clear that the schools must be the centers of change. It should be equally clear that the schools must be significantly altered to accomplish this. Extended contracts without students, extended resources for development of skills in both planning and instruction, and reflective time to contemplate the changes which might produce increased effectiveness will all be necessary to create the "culture of change." Improvement will follow.

References

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Brookover, W. (1982). Creating effective schools. Florida: Learning Publications, Inc.

Caldwell, S. & Wood, F. (1988, October). School-Based improvement: Are we ready?, Educational Leadership, 50-53.

Cawelti, G. (1986, June). Elementary, high school futures networks plan schools for life in the 21st century. ASCD Update, 28(4), 1-12.

Goodlad, J. (1983). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill.

Heider, J. (1985). The Tao of leadership: Leadership strategies for a new age. New York: Bantam Books..

Honeyman, D. & Jensen, R. (1988, February). School site budgeting. School Business Affairs, 12-14.

Katz, R. (1988). Human relations skills can be shaped. In People: Managing your most important asset. Boston: Harvard Business Review.

Levine, N. (1989). Community mobilization: Action planning. In Governor's alliance against drugs community mobilization training. Phoenix: State of Arizona.

Lieberman, A. (1988, February). Expanding the leadership. Educational Leadership, 4-8.

Lieberman, A. (1988, May). Teachers and principals: Turf, tension and new tasks, Phi Delta Kappan, 648-53.

Maeroff, G. (1988, July/August). Power in the classroom, Foundation News, 40-43

Netzer, J. (1981). Strategies for instructional management. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Paquett, M. (1987). Voluntary collegial support groups for teachers, Educational Leadership, 36-39.

Pareek, U. (1981). Developing collaboration in organizations. In The 1981 annual handbook for group facilitators. San Diego: University Associates.

Patterson, J. Purkey, S. & Parker, J. (1986). Productive systems for a non-rational world. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Peters, T. & Waterman, H. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper and Rowe.

Prasch, J. (1984, October). Reversing the trend toward centralization, Educational Leadership, 27-29.

Rallis, S. (1988, May). Room at the top: Conditions for effective school leadership, Phi Delta Kappan. 643-647.

School-based management. (1989). Virginia: The American Association of School Administrators, The National Association of Elementary School Principals and The National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Sherif, M. & Sherif, C.W.. (1953). School centered decision making and renewal. Phi Delta Kappan, 660-664.

ADDENDUM I: ACTION PLANNING

"Just Do It."
-Ad for Nike shoes

Action Planning is a process which outlines the steps needed to overcome a problem, or realize an opportunity. It is a process to develop strategies for positive change.

Goals are more often achieved when they are well thought out, written down, and when the possible barriers to achievement are considered. If we don't know where we are going, we will never know when we have arrived. Planning is an essential process in achieving goals. The action plan process gives organization and structure to problem-solving. It provides us with a map for achievement.

The Action Plan format presented in this section may be used by individuals or by groups. It is one of many problem solving formats available. We have chosen it because of its simplicity and thoroughness. In this section we will concentrate on the use of the Action Plan by Community Teams.

When used by a group, such as the Governor's Alliance Against Drugs Community Team, action planning is a collaboration that permits individual members to have an influence on the outcome of decisions. It provides for involvement of the very people who are part of the change, and invites them to make extra investments of interest, time, and responsibility for the outcome. Action planning develops a starting point for even the largest problem.

By following the structured format in completing an Action Plan, the individual or group goes through a logical sequence of

identification, gathering of resources, and structuring and planning strategies. The Action Plan serves as a guide and monitoring tool which prevents the group or individual from getting sidetracked and from duplicating efforts. The Action Plan allows one the opportunity to share responsibilities for completing the task as well as a specific timeline to adhere to.

Action plans have been put to excellent use by Community Teams to plan and map strategies to be used in their team activities and to address community-wide problems.

The steps involved in community based decision-making and planning are:

Step 1: Assessing Needs

Step 2: Developing a Plan of Action

Step 3: Evaluate and Monitor Your Plan

Step 4: Communicating Your Success

Step 1: Assessing Needs

Any effective program must begin with a clear-eyed assessment of where the community is right now. A needs assessment includes the concerns, problems, or opportunities for improvement. It is a clear statement of "*what is*" and of "*what could be*".

Step 2: Developing a Plan of Action

The major components of the Action Plan format presented in **Figure 1** include Goal, Strategies, Tasks, Responsibilities and Target Dates, Assessment Methods, and Communicating Successes.

Choosing a Goal:

It is critical that members of the community team agree on a common set of goals that will provide the basis for community-based improvement efforts. A **goal** is a statement of the target you wish to achieve, the end state you wish to reach. Your needs assessment helps you determine where you are. Your goal statement should reflect where you want to go. Goal statements are written in measurable terms, with a specific observable change identified and a time frame for reaching said change.

Strategies:

Strategies are the approaches or steps which could be taken to overcome the problem or realize the opportunity and, thus, achieve the goal. These are the methods you could use for realizing your ends. There are a variety of specific methods that might achieve your Goal.

Strategies may be programs, activities, schedules, or modifications of approaches and may be implemented in a specific, isolated area or community-wide depending upon the nature of the problem.

When selecting among possible strategies, it is important that careful consideration be given to developing criteria for judging the probable outcome of each individual strategy. Criteria for the group decision whether or not to use a strategy might include **need, interest, availability of resources, ease of completion, cost effective-ness or visibility.**

Tasks:

For each strategy, a number of tasks will be identified. **Tasks** are specific action steps including the **Person(s) Responsible** for conducting or monitoring the task, and the **Target Date** by which the task must be completed. If your team finds that they are developing a very long list of tasks for a particular strategy, it might mean that that strategy is complicated and requires its own Action Plan for implementation.

Step 3: Evaluate and Monitor Your Plan

Each Action Plan should include a proposed **Assessment Method.** Build in a way to evaluate whether or not the actions you are taking will achieve your goal. Whether a simple pre-post needs assessment or climate survey or an elaborate research study is employed, you must determine how successful your efforts have been. This step involves Collecting Feedback and Evaluating your efforts.

During the first Apollo journey to the moon, NASA ground control and space capsule astronauts made thousands of course corrections based on an almost constant monitoring of their progress towards their goal. The key to successful community team programs is to build in a series of monitoring and evaluation activities to make it possible to make adjustments before they become too far "off course."

Remember, it is also important to continually monitor and review how you are doing as a team. Time should be allotted after each working session to process team interactions. A schedule

should be established for reviewing the group goals and whether all members agree with and support them.

Tasks will require **Resources-** people, time, money, programs. Whenever possible it is best to incorporate existing programs or activities into your action plan. Coordinate your efforts with your existent community efforts. Identify **Resources** by answering these questions:

- What resources (time, money, skills, humans) are available to us?
- What resources can we create or develop to assist in reaching our goal?

Look at the resources that are available in your immediate community first, and then enlarge the scope if necessary.

At the same time, consider as a team the **Cautions** or possible detours you may encounter when implementing your plan. Identifying the possible obstacles to attaining your goal involves answering the questions:

- What may have caused the situation?
- What is maintaining the situation?
- What factors may impede progress toward your goal?

Step 4: Communicating Your Success

People on your team, in the team's support system and in the community are just a few of your important "publics" who need to be informed to be engaged in supporting your efforts. Your publics need to know how committed you are, how hard you are working and

how successful your efforts have been. It is important to look at your Action Plan strategies and tasks and answer these questions:

1. If this part of our plan is to be successful, which of our publics needs to know about it?
2. What do they need to know?
3. Which communication method(s) will be most effective in sharing the information?

The Process for Developing Action Plans

A variety of strategies may be used in developing action plans. One of these strategies involves the use of the following four substeps done repetitively for each section of the action plan. Although not always necessary, these substeps are an excellent method for obtaining total team participation in the development of the action plan.

Step 1: Brainstorm

If your goin' to try something new, you might as well go way out on a limb. The fruit's usually better out there anyway.

Will Rogers

Brainstorming is a technique designed to help members of a group develop as many ideas as possible in a short period of time. The purpose of brainstorming is to encourage creativity and generate ideas. The process of Brainstorming prescribed here is called "nominal Brainstorming".

"Why To's"

- It enables all members of the group to participate and thus encourages members who might be dominated or shy.
- It generates a great many ideas in a short period of time. It offers an opportunity for ideas to be combined to produce the solution.
- The amount of time wasted discussing or criticizing ideas is eliminated. Valuable time is preserved for the group on priority items produced.

"How to's"

- The topic, problem, or goal of the session is announced and explained as briefly as possible.
- Participants have only two or three minutes to consider the question.
- One at a time, in rotation around a table or group, each participant will give a brief suggestion and/or answer. Do not elaborate on or explain ideas at this time. You may, however, piggyback on another person's idea.
- All ideas will be recorded and posted where the group may see them.
- There can be no criticism or any discussion of any idea by a participant, save during the clarification that follows Brainstorming. There are no right or wrong answers.
- Everyone should be encouraged to have a second or third idea ready in case their first idea is mentioned before their turn. Continue around the group until each member has exhausted their individual lists.

Step 2: Clarify

Any ideas generated during brainstorming are clarified at this time. Questions are asked, and any confusion or misunderstandings are cleared up about recorded statements or ideas. This is not a time for criticism of ideas. Attempt to state your ideas in the "positive" as this sets in motion the process of looking for positive solutions.

Step 3: Prioritize

After clarifying, ideas generated are ranked or prioritized in some type of order. You may have identified appropriate criteria for consideration here. They may be ranked according to importance, degree or urgency, ease of accomplishment, availability of resources, etc. One procedure that can be used to prioritize is:

a. Determine how many choices are to be selected from the list resulting from brainstorming. The example used here would identify the top three selections from numerous possibilities.

b. Individual team members privately rank their top three selections.

1st choice receives **5 points**
2nd choice receives **3 points**
3rd choice receives **1 point**

c. Recorder collects the individual rankings and calculates a total for each item on the original list. A grid may be used to post and share the results.

d. If one item leads by a wide margin, members continue on to **Consensus.**

e. If numerical values are somewhat equal among the choices, prioritizing needs to be repeated by returning to step a, asking each individual to rank from a smaller sample - for example, individuals may choose their top two choices from the six which received the most points. Continue this procedure until a clear choice emerges.

Step 4: Consensus

One of the top choices is selected, it is important to conduct a verbal consensus check of all team members, making certain that each person indicates his/her agreement with the result of prioritizing. The process of reaching consensus may involve the following steps.

- State the decision that is proposed.
- Someone offers to paraphrase the proposed decision.
- The person proposing the decision judges the accuracy of the paraphrase.
- If the paraphrase is accurate the person proposing the decision or the chairperson asks each group member to state whether he or she can support the decision, and, if not, to state a possible alternative.

- If all persons agree to support the decision, consensus has been reached and the decision is made.
- If one or more persons do not agree to support the decision, but offer alternatives, each alternative may be tested by asking each group member whether or not he or she can support it. At this point, other methods of showing support, such as voting, may occur.
- If consensus cannot be reached on existing alternatives, others should be requested or generated.
- If no alternative can be agreed upon, the reasons why persons cannot reach consensus should be stated.
- If consensus cannot be reached on the alternatives proposed, a new time should be set to review the issue, or an alternative decision-making process should be agreed upon.

Four ingredients must exist for people to reach consensus. You must have a group of people willing to work together, a problem or issue that requires a decision by the group, trust that there is a solution, and perseverance to continue until an acceptable solution is reached.

You have achieved consensus when:

- everyone agrees to support the decision, even though it may not be everyone's first choice
- everyone agrees that he or she has had sufficient opportunity to influence the decision
- everyone can state what the decision is

Achieving consensus is not always possible or necessary. Reread the decision-making information in your notebook section "Group Process" on consensus to review the effects of using this versus other decision-making procedures.

The Action Plan Form is used as the instrument for generating group activities and directions. Many such instruments and problem solving processes are available. We have selected this particular format for one simple reason -- **it works.**

Ned S. Levine
Tucson, Arizona
Rev. 11/14/89

Mobilizing the Community: Activities of the Team

People should receive energy, inspiration and education as a result of team membership. There will be fundamental choices to be made about the actions of your group- choices about:

- The mission or goals you will pursue
- The programs/services you will offer to accomplish this mission
- How you will attract and utilize the resources you need - people, money, expertise, facilities, etc.

Such choices are facilitated through a team planning process which is continuous, flexible and engages all members of the community team in decisions and actions which 1) define the situation as it currently exists in the community (Defining the Problem), 2) choose a goal to attain (Choosing a Target), and 3) develop and implement a specific plan of action for reaching that goal (Developing a Plan).

- **Defining the Problem: "What do you intend to do?"**

  Enhance problem awareness
  Recruit Key Leadership
  Identify Target Audiences
  Create Working Coalitions

- **Choosing a Target: "What is needed and feasible in your community?**

  Establish a mission or philosophy statement
  Establish Goals
  Engage Target Audiences

- **Developing a Plan: "What are you capable of doing?"**

  Develop a Specific Plan of Action for Critical Issues
  Establish Team Capabilities and Team/Community Resources
  Create Working Coalitions
  Mobilize Interest
  Execute Campaign
  Monitor Progress
  Continue Positive Efforts
  Celebrate and Reinforce Accomplishments

Technical Assistance for Community Team Tasks

Help is available for Team tasks such as:

- Group Norms, Leadership, Expectations, Commitment
- Community Needs Assessment, Compilation, Interpretation of Data
- Team and Community Goal Setting
- Community Program Models
- Developing Community Support
- Evaluation of Team Actions and Projects

Community Teams will typically address all of the above activities at some time. It is not unusual for teams to reach an impasse in their growth. It is at these times that additional technical support may be secured to move the team through non-productive periods.

Non-Productive Situations or Behaviors to Watch For:

- Lack of team productivity
- Drop in attendance
- Major shift in leadership
- Large number of new members
- Saturation of easy to reach market/need to address hard to reach sectors
- Political situations/polarizations
- Crises times: arrests of children, deaths or suicides, major gang activity

Knowing is not enough:
We must apply.

Willing is not enough:
We must do.
Goethe

Change Agent Needs 3 Qualities

Credibility — **to overcome cognitive dissonance**

Flexibility — for when they won't accept your first solution

Generosity — cause you'll get a lot more done if you don't care who gets the credit

Paradigm Change Requires

Vision — **to see a better world**

Will — **to know you can do it**

Commitment — **personal investment**

Sometimes
Our light goes out,
But it is blown
again
into flame by an encounter
With another human being

Each of us owes our deepest thanks
To those who have rekindled
This inner light.

Albert Schweitzer

Small Group Meetings:

School-Based Practice

In-Service Training--School-Based Practice

M. R. Bryan
Office of Special Education Programs

Defining the Issue

Almost two decades have passed since PL 94-142 mandated public schools to provide a free and appropriate education for all children with disabilities. Yet today, educators--both "regular" and "special"--are unprepared to meet the challenges of developing and implementing educational programs that meet the individual needs of these children. Resources and expertise have been available to train educators to accomplish this task, yet there continues to be a gap between "best" and actual educational practice in many classrooms. A number of factors contribute to widening or maintaining this gap. Examples of those identified during our discussions are the following:

1. The type of child served in the schools is changing. There are increased numbers of medically fragile children as well as those with severe emotional and educational problems associated with drug abuse and health-related impairments. Teachers are untrained to accommodate the wide diversity of disabilities that exist in their classrooms.

2. Reporting requirements to satisfy federal and state regulations have increased. In many cases, regular educators perceive the responsibility for paperwork to be the domain of the special educators. In a fully integrated setting, the question arises as to who has the responsibility for compliance. Management issues such as this reduce the likelihood of

interdisciplinary cooperation in program development and implementation.

3. Parents and educators are at times at odds as to the definition and value of integration. From a broad perspective, integration refers not only to the classroom, but to the community as well. Some parents are reluctant to place their child in an integrated setting for fear of losing the "special" services that they believe their child needs. Resources for integrating students into the community appear to be unavailable for teachers and parents alike, and training support for guiding these choices is limited.

4. Traditional models of in-service have not been successful in reducing the gap. In-service programs have typically focused on the student's needs (as opposed to the teacher's), follow-up training has not been provided to the targeted trainees, and very little attention has been given to facilitating systems change. The long-term benefit of this type of in-service training has been limited.

The primary goal for education is to provide all students the opportunity to learn and work towards being integrated into their community. A clear need exists to develop preservice and inservice training for school personnel which will enable them to accomplish this task. Preservice training would provide the basis for interdisciplinary training, and in-service could serve as follow-up and technical assistance for school personnel in the work force.

Alternative Solutions

In the ideal setting, the teachers would be prepared to facilitate learning--on-going, continuing learning--in a community-based resource center. The child would be the center of learning with the total development of the child taken into consideration. The child with a disability would be fully integrated into this setting with the resources and skilled professionals to address the total needs. An environment conducive to learning for all children would be available.

The program would be all-inclusive, extending beyond the school for community and business involvement. Courses would include problem-oriented modules. The focus would be on "learning how to learn," how to be problem-solvers. Application of all the newly acquired information and skills would be made in a variety of settings in order to make it relevant and meaningful. Opportunities would abound for the application of the principles in real life situations.

Personnel would be trained to provide a comprehensive program which is responsive to community needs. Intergenerational learning would be a part of the program, offering activities for the involvement of all family members. In addition, there would be a central source for parents to obtain information about, including how to participate in, all services available for their children.

The facilities and equipment would include the most modern technology to facilitate learning. In-service education would update all "learning facilitators" in the use of the technology. Segregated "special education" as we know it today would no longer

exist. Similarly, IEP compliance would be a requirement of the past, as there would no longer be a need for separate treatment within an atmosphere of all-inclusion.

Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal

Much of the discussion around the barriers to implementing the ideal program focused on the limited resources as well as impediments to "systems change." Training in community-based learning will help to minimize/alleviate the misconceptions about special education as all personnel will be trained to address the total needs of the individual child. In addition, parents, teachers, and special educators will team so that all are "stakeholders" in the training. Systems change must occur in order to affect individual attitudes. As we move toward integration, it is important for parents, teachers, and special educators to "vision" what they want for their children. Currently, there is a lack of clarity among all participants (stakeholders) about what they want to happen. Special educators, regular educators, and parents have not yet thoroughly examined the process for the change. Educators need to conceptualize as continuing education--not in-service--as it is more evolving and ongoing.

In a systems change model, the training approach must include the superintendent and principal, and the training must occur at each local school. In Canada, there are a number of models; for example, the McGill University Center for Integrated Education directed by George Flynn Marshall. Conceptually, in this model each

child is viewed as a unique individual. The only label the child wears is his/her name.

In order to introduce school-based practice into the local school, substantial change must occur in the system. In order to be implemented with the least resistance, the incentive to initiate change should be voluntary, not mandatory. Yet, a challenge exists as to how to introduce the systems change. In an organization change may be initiated either from the bottom up, from the top down, or a combination of the two. Generally, change occurs more rapidly when instituted by the top management. Change initiated at the grassroots level usually occurs more slowly as there could be resistance when the change is introduced at each level.

Principals, for example, are often closed to the process which occurs at the grassroots level. However, the changes which are generated by communities, including parents, are often effective. Angry parents can move with a vision about improvement for all children. Out of a crisis comes positive change. An example of the latter type of change occurred in the Davis County District Schools, Farmington, Utah. Students and parents created a ground swell. Over a three-year period, they succeeded in a collaborative effort to organize the Neighborhood School for All. The key to the success of the systems change was that the district director of special education supported the parents' efforts.

Higher education must be included to set the trend and break the loop which perpetuates the practices in higher education training programs. There must be a philosophical "buying in" from the teaching faculty. Training should occur at the university level

as they seem to have a grasp of collaboration and team work models. All trainers could potentially play the role of consultant or facilitator of systems change.

As an important part of implementing systems change, strategic thinking and planning groups meet in the schools. This is a facilitative process with shared responsibility for challenges and rewards. For example, in Utah leadership management institutes have been conducted to teach all participants how to be decision makers, how to deal with resistance to change, and how to implement change. Other examples of systems change projects are those at Wayne State University, University of Minnesota, and Syracuse University. It is imperative to have the top manager of an organization participate in learning the model and in implementing the model involving all stakeholders.

Once teachers become involved in systems change, they are electric. Ownership in the system stimulates discussion. Once the teachers feel they have a voice, they become evangelists. The conversation is positive and is centered around how children are learning. The negatives are removed, the limitations are taken out of the visionary process. The master plan evolves, and how this process occurs is critical to the success of its implementation.

Building bridges with community resources is an important link in the system. With the local interagency councils, all elements must collaborate and parents must be involved. When the children who have participated in early intervention enter the public schools, they will bring with them the experience of a family-centered approach. Parents are the shakers and the movers

of the early intervention program and of successful community-based programs for school-aged children. Parents must continue to be involved as partners in teaching their children.

Parent-initiated programs started integrated child care in the Arlington City Schools (Virginia). One day care provider took the initiative and changed the system. What had been designated as "in-service" training time became "ongoing" training time. This implemented a completely changed system. In Arizona a community-based program for children, which is family directed, was organized for $1,500.

The discussants believe that the Federal government should assume an active role in systems change. Parent input is important to change the Federal system. In the discretionary grant competitions, priorities should require collaboration, parent partnerships, and community-based initiates in all training and demonstration projects. Leadership is needed at the national level which guides states in implementing partnerships to enact change. More extensive dissemination of information and products developed with Federally funded projects is needed.

Educators can gain knowledge from industry on organizational development. The National Governor's Council on Policy Developers is a valuable resource. The model from industry would help educators to know how to involve resisters and how to be effective change agents.

In conclusion, a number of issues have been discussed relative to the changes in schools which necessitate improved preparation of personnel. Preparing personnel cannot occur in isolation. In

order to address the problems, the needs of the children must be viewed from a holistic perspective within a systems change framework in the schools.

The contributions of this author were solely in her private capacity. No official support or endorsement by the Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

Martha R. Bryan
Education Research Analyst
U.S. Department of Education

The School as the Center of Educational Reform: Implications of School-Based Practice for Research

Linda A. Patriarca
Michigan State University

Patricia Thomas Cegelka
San Diego State University

Abstract

In this paper we describe research needs in light of the sweeping changes taking place in school-based practice. First, we identify the tenets of educational reform and the societal concerns fueling demands for reform. Next, we sketch the context in which changes in educational practices are occurring, describe the evolving relationships among educators, schools and researchers, and discuss the need to create and infuse new knowledge about teaching and learning into existing practices. We then explore the implications of reform for school reorganization and for restructuring teacher education and personnel development. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of the need to change the ways research on school-based practices is designed and conducted. In essence, we argue that the dicotomy between research and practice is counterproductive. We call for coordinated projects of research which bring together researchers with expertise in various methodologies to tackle different, but complementary problems in a domain of inquiry. Such projects would involve **both** the development and documentation of effective school-based practices, and would include teachers as

partners in the design, implementation, and documentation of new knowledge. This, we contend is needed to achieve significant improvements in teaching and learning.

Context of Evolving Research Needs

Sweeping reforms in the structures and practices of our nation's schools are certain to impact the education provided to all students, including those served by special education. Several societal concerns are fueling these demands for reform. One concern emanates from fears that schools are not adjusting their education to produce the skilled and creative workforce that American business of the 21st century will need to retain its competitive position in the global economy. A second (and related) concern stems from national and international achievement test results which suggest that students are not developing the understanding of subject matter needed to apply knowledge and utilize information in ways that business and industry will require in the coming years (American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1989). A third concern arises from the demographic changes in society. A greater proportion of America's student population is non-white, poor, coming from families whose primary language is not English, and being raised in single-parent homes.

In response to these concerns, business executives, educators and policymakers have developed agendas for change and launched reform initiatives. Reform recommendations have focused on improving: (a) teaching and learning for K-12 students; (b) the

preservice and inservice education of educators (teachers, administrators, counselors, etc.); and (c) the organization and management of schools.

During this same time period, the field of special education has been engaged in an introspective assessment of its own policies and practices. Professionals, dissatisfied with what they viewed as the unintended, but negative consequences of the implementation of Public Law 94-142, criticized the organizational and funding systems which labeled students and educated them in segregated special education settings. Proponents of the movement, initially referred to as the Regular Education Initiative or "REI" argued that all students should be integrated into the educational mainstream and that the system should be restructured to accommodate such integration (Biklen, 1985; Lipsky & Gartner, 1989; Stainback & Stainback, 1991).

Although reformers in general and special education may differ in their approach or what they choose to focus on in reforming education, they do share some underlying premises. All agree that reforming our educational institutions is a difficult and high risk endeavor requiring a massive and coordinated effort of **coalition building** across societal sectors as well as a comprehensive and thriving culture of **collaboration** within the profession at every level. **Coalition building across professions** involves establishing partnerships with business and government to provide, among other things, economic and political support for long-term, large-scale reform efforts. **Collaboration within the profession** involves the establishment of

partnerships between universities and schools to improve teaching and learning, enhance the preparation of prospective teachers and restructure schools (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986). It also requires increased collaboration between classroom teachers and teachers in entitlement programs (e.g., Chapter I, bilingual education, special education) to eliminate separatism and create a more unified system of service delivery (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987). Increased levels of collaboration also have been called for between general education and special education applied researchers (Reynolds & Wang, 1983).

School-Based Practice as the Focus of Reform

Achieving such widespread changes in schools and systems will require new relationships between schools and the people who work in them as well as new relationships between/among teacher educators, researchers, and teachers. A fundamental goal is to transform the profession of teaching from an isolated, individual enterprise to a collaborative one which fosters experimentation and creation of new knowledge in settings where such change is supported. Johnson and Pugach (1992) view the emphasis on professional collaboration in educational reform as a bridge which can effect the merger of general and special education if, as they predict, such efforts result in the construction of heterogeneous classes more capable of meeting the diverse needs of children. Many futurists view such collaboration as prerequisite to achieving

the successful school of the 21st century: one that produces liberally educated young people who can, under conditions of uncertainty, work responsibly, negotiate within a community of interests, and learn from and collaborate with one another (Skrtic, 1991; Reich, 1990).

In sum, the school is the center of reform efforts, and school-based practice is at the heart of the reform. Such reconceptualizations of the purposes and meaning of school have rather profound implications not only for teaching, but for research as well. These changes, in turn, have implications for the way that teachers, teacher educators, and researchers conceptualize and conduct their work. As we examine the paucity of school-based instructional research in special education (MacMillan, Keogh, & Jones, 1986; Semel, 1987) against this backdrop of dramatic change, the need to develop and research effective school-based practices has never been greater.

Implications of Reform for Research on Teaching and Learning

Over the past 15 years, research in cognitive science and education have provided us with new and important knowledge about teaching and learning. For instance, we have more powerful definitions of **learning** which inform us that the essence of learning is to link new information to prior knowledge and that "good" learners use a variety of cognitive and metacognitive strategies for making these critical connections. We also know

much more about the processes of **teaching** that effect conceptual change in students. Called "strategic teaching," it refers to a role and a process in which the teacher considers four variables in developing instruction--characteristics of the learner, material to be learned, criterial tasks and learning strategies. "Good" teaching involves identifying content priorities and relating them to learning, developing effective instructional strategies for making critical learning connections, and relating assessment to instruction and learning (Jones, Palinscar, Ogle, & Carr, 1987).

Such advances in our knowledge base, although insufficient and incomplete, do provide a solid base upon which to draw in initiating needed changes in our educational system. Thus, one major thrust of needed research in school-based practice is to **transform** the knowledge we do have into practice. We need multiple studies which document attempts to integrate current knowledge into existing practice, to study what it looks like in diverse settings, and document what outcomes result from this infusion of research-based knowledge in real classrooms.

In addition to infusing current knowledge into practice, we also need to create **new** knowledge about teaching and learning through school-based research focused on practice. The agenda for inquiry in this case grows out of the daily work of teachers and students and is defined as the common task of both university and school faculty (Holmes Group, 1990). It encompasses such broad topics as representing subject matter ideas in ways which promote understanding among diverse learners, assessing conceptual change in students, developing more contextualized, authentic

assessments which inform instruction, determining student views of the content and processes of instruction (including awareness of their own role in learning), and evaluating classroom processes from the perspective of classrooms as learning communities.

As K-12 teachers assume more responsibility for educating an increasingly diverse student population, we must also examine how, and in what ways, increases or decreases in net resources per class (e.g., class size, use of paraprofessionals) and/or adoption of particular instructional technologies affect the achievement of all students--particularly those considered difficult-to-teach.

Implications of Reform for Research on Organizations

Although transforming current knowledge into practice and generating new knowledge about teaching and learning are critical ingredients of successful reform, they will prove insufficient if unaccompanied by concomittant changes in the ways that schools are organized and managed (Sarason, 1983; Skrtic, 1991). Skrtic (1987, 1988) argues that the organizational structure of schools--not unwilling teachers or unable students--is the greatest impediment to successful school reform. In a recent interview, Skrtic reminds us that bureaucratic institutions are not designed to individualize services, but to standardize them. Consequently, he advocates transforming present school structures into adhocracies--ad hoc teams of professionals formed within schools dedicated to improving, individualizing, and personalizing learning for all youngsters (Thousand, 1990).

Schlechty (1990) characterizes the transformation which needs to take place in schools as moving from an assembly line model of education where curriculum is viewed as a body of lore to be passed on to students to one where curriculum is a body of material to be processed, molded, and formed by students. In this new organization, which he calls a "knowledge work organization," teachers become both inventors and leaders. Principals and superintendents become ". . . leaders of leaders, creators of conditions in which other leaders thrive and developers of leaders. . . ." (pp. 43-44).

Principals and superintendents are not the only administrative personnel who will need to make substantial shifts in roles and responsibilities. School boards, central office administrators, and staff development personnel must also change to support school-based improvement (Caldwell & Wood, 1988). In the words of Sirotnik and Clark (1988), schools must become **centers of change** rather than targets of change which function as **centers of inquiry** rather than as sites of study. Administrators, then, in conjunction with school and university faculty, must experiment with and document new forms of organization and new forms of leadership which support the school as centers of change devoted to generating and using knowledge. Studying the processes and effects of such initiatives as: (a) involving parents, students, teachers, and administrators in planning school-wide goals; (b) decentralizing decision-making to give local schools more control over curriculum, professional development, staffing, scheduling, and expenditures of resources;

(c) experimenting with current service delivery models such as eliminating tracking in secondary settings, integrating special education students into general education classrooms, or reconceptualizing entitlement programs; and (d) building professional cultures of collaboration among various professionals within schools and communities to support positive changes in teaching and learning are among the sorely needed areas of research.

Implications of School Reform for Research on Teacher Education

A classic problem in teacher education has been the decoupling of coursework and practica. All too often, the knowledge prospective teachers acquire in their coursework about curriculum and instructional methods is not being utilized in the classrooms in which they are placed. Consequently, they do not see how the knowledge learned in coursework is relevant and useful to practice. An even more dismal scenario occurs when the practices they observe conflict directly with those promoted by the college/university and supported by research data. Situating teacher education in schools where reforms are underway makes it possible to connect best practices to current theory and research in teacher education. Moreover, it allows for a more thorough and grounded investigation of how novices learn to teach. In these settings, we could track the development of teacher candidates over time on such diverse dimensions as: (a) beliefs about teaching, learning, and learners; (b) development of content and

pedagogical knowledge; (c) ability to organize classrooms for effective instruction; (d) skills in orchestrating discourse; and (e) capacities for reflecting on and evaluating one's own teaching. If we link the changes we observe in prospective teachers' beliefs, skills, and capacities directly to the learning opportunities afforded them in school-based practice, we can construct a knowledge base on which to build good problem-based clinical teacher education.

In addition, if we hope to produce teachers who will participate in the design and execution of research as well as benefit from new knowledge generated by research, then research must play a prominent role in our preservice preparation programs. Lewis and Blackhurst (1983) argue that teacher candidates need to develop a basic understanding of the **content** of research (e.g., the findings of empirical studies), the **processes** of research (e.g., measurement, research design, etc.), and the **application** of research (e.g., design, completion, and dissemination of actual research) in order to make rational, data-based decisions about the conduct of their classrooms, systematically address classroom challenges, and evaluate new approaches, materials, or programs. Others argue (Cochran-Smith, 1991) that the only way to prepare prospective teachers to confront, address, and document the dilemmas and successes in teaching is to place them with experienced teachers who are working to reform teaching in specific situations inside of schools, who are raising questions about their own situations, and who are studying their own practice. These different perspectives demonstrate the disparate

views which exist in our field today and underscore the critical need for research on teacher education.

Implications of School Reform for Conducting Research: Diversifying Methodology and Roles

As new service delivery structures evolve, student diversity widens and educational requirements increase, we must expand and, in some cases, rethink our notions about what constitutes "good" educational research. Traditional educational research paradigms have emphasized quantifiable observations which lend themselves to analyses by means of mathematical tools, with the purpose of establishing causal relationships. These knowledge-driven models have been described as "scientific approaches that create and build a coherent body of knowledge about educational processes" (Keeves, 1988, p. 170). Wittrock (1986) observed that the exciting empirical findings on effective teaching, teacher education, and school effects all emanated from such research paradigms in the field of educational psychology.

Noting the sociological, political, and ecological nature of many special education concerns, Semmel (1987) laments the field's continued reliance on the disciplines of psychology as the basic sources of theoretical guidance and stimulation. He argues that it is the nature of individual learning and behavioral differences in the context of social sciences which should guide the development of an instructional science for difficult-to-teach students. In recent years, action-research models have emphasized

holistic and qualitative informational and interpretive approaches to educational problem-solving (Husen, 1988).

Although much energy has been expended arguing the superiority of one approach over the other, Shulman (1988) recommends the judicious use of the variety of methods comprising educational research: historical, philosophical, case studies, ethnographic field studies, experiments, quasi-experiments, and surveys. He contends that quantitative and qualitative forms of inquiry are not merely different paths to answering the same question, but that they involve using different tools to answer different questions. Table 1 below illustrates this point. Here we select a domain of inquiry--in this case, the study of writing--and describe how questions might be framed and studies conducted through the appropriate application of the variety of research methodology available.

The study of teaching, however, is the study of a very complex enterprise. It involves the construction of appropriate learning tasks, coordination of working groups, planning and implementation of curriculum, allocation of resources and activities, and the interpretation and application of policies initiated by administrators, parents, and other stakeholders external to the classroom. None of these define teaching, yet all of them comprise teaching. And, although different facets of teaching are best studied from the perspective of particular disciplines, no one discipline is powerful enough to produce sufficient knowledge capable of achieving significant improvements in teaching.

Table 1

Application of Research Methods to Research Questions

Research Question(s)	Methodology	Description
Why are some students successful writers while others are not? How can we predict which which students are going to experience difficulty in learning to write?	Correlational	The relationship between predictors (identified through demographic data, personal school history data, etc.) and student performance measures on a variety of tasks are investigated.
What are the best possible methods for teaching writing to students?	Experimental Quasi-experimental	Students are assigned to groups and provided with contrasting methods of instruction. Performance of contrasting groups are assessed.
What is the general level of writing performance across different groups in the population?	Survey	Mail surveys, telephone surveys, or face-to-face interviews are used to obtain information about writing performance from the target populations.
How is writing instruction carried on in classrooms? What are the rules which underlie instruction? What are the experiences of teachers and students?	Case Study	Planned observations, interviews, work samples and/or videotaped excerpts are collected in natural settings to study a particular classroom or small number of classrooms.

Consequently, we believe that there is a need for research which is purposefully and carefully planned to address a coordinated set of research questions around enduring problems of teaching practice. It is likely that such projects will involve the employment of diverse methodology and will require cooperative

approaches by researchers from different disciplines. The following is one hypothetical case in point.

> Tracking is a common practice in high schools today. Approximately 30% of all ninth graders are enrolled in low track mathematics classes, commonly referred to as General Mathematics. For many of these students, it is the only mathematics course they take in high school. Such limited background in mathematics restricts future college and career choices. A disproportionate number of these students are female, poor, and non-white, which has caused some professionals to question whether social discrimination is a factor in student placement.
>
> Teachers and researchers working together to improve teaching and learning for at-risk students have, through their discussions, identified general mathematics classes as an important site for study and have posed the following questions:
>
> 1. How do students get into general math courses?
> 2. Can we predict which students are likely to end up in general mathematics?
> 3. What are their experiences once enrolled?

The investigation of these questions requires three distinct methodological approaches--namely; survey, correlational, and case study. Normally, researchers who specialize in these different approaches do not work on interdisciplinary teams together, but if they were to form such collectives to study school-based problems of practice, the resultant products should lead to more thorough and refined understandings of the phenomenon under study and more powerful, multi-pronged approaches for addressing problems.

In addition, we must re-examine the traditional roles associated with the terms "researcher" and "teacher." The study of teaching should be a collaborative enterprise, one in which

researchers work **with** teachers rather than conduct research **on** them. Research should emanate from practice and should use the concerns, problems, insights, and activities of practitioners as the starting point. Practitioners of many kinds--general education teachers, special education teachers, teacher educators, and teacher candidates--together with their researcher colleagues, should be involved in designing and conducting disciplined investigations of the problem and assessing the results. The new knowledge derived from these investigations should then be returned to this same domain of practice by informing judgments and improving teaching and learning. In essence, what we are calling for is the establishment of communities of lifelong learners where each participant contributes a unique set of skills and expertise to the enduring problems of practice.

In sum, we hope that practitioners and their needs will influence the substance and form of educational research just as profoundly as we hope educational research will influence educational practice.

Conclusion

The challenges posed by society's need to educate the next generation of Americans to function successfully in a knowledge age society and the changing demographic shifts in the population heighten the need to link research and practice in powerful and enduring ways. No longer is it appropriate to view the researcher as the producer of knowledge and the teacher as the consumer of knowledge; no longer is it acceptable to view the teacher educator

as the individual who assumes primary responsibility for the preparation of teachers and the researcher as the individual who studies them.

Such dichotomies have been, in large measure, responsible for the current gap which exists between research and practice. The law of proximal variables states that the closer a variable is to an outcome of interest, the higher the probability is of the former directly impacting on the latter. This emphasizes the centrality of the school site and the classroom teacher in addressing the challenges which lie ahead. As new school structures emerge and new school-based practices evolve, they must be subjected to critical analyses. These new alternatives must be developed and validated through practitioner-researcher partnerships if an ecologically valid, empirically based instructional science is to evolve to meet the educational needs of difficult-to-teach students at the school site level.

References

American Association for the Advancement of Science. (1989). Science for all Americans: A Project 2061 report of the literacy goals in science, mathematics, and technology. Washington, DC: Author.

Biklen, D. (1989). Achieving the complete school. New York: Columbia University Press.

Caldwell, S. D., & Wood, F. H. (1988, October). School-based improvement: Are we ready? Educational Leadership, 46(2), 50-53.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. Harvard Educational Review, 61(3), 279-310.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools: A report of the Holmes Group. Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Husen, T. (1988). Research paradigms in education. In J. P. Keeves (Ed.), Educational research methodology and measurement: An international handbook. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press, Inc.

Johnson, L. J., & Pugach, M. C. (1992). Continuing the dialogue: Embracing a more expansive understanding of collaborative relationships. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Controversial issues confronting special education: Divergent perspectives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Jones, B. F., Palincsar, A. S., Ogle, D. S., & Carr, E. G. (1987). Strategic teaching: A cognitive focus. In B. F. Jones, A. S. Palincsar, D. S. Ogle, & E. G. Carr (Eds.), Strategic teaching and learning: Cognitive instruction in the content areas. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Keeves, J. P. (1988). Issues in the creation, diffusion, and utilization of knowledge. In J. P. Keeves (Ed.), Educational research, methodology, and measurement: An international handbook. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press, Inc.

Lewis, R. B., & Blackhurst, A. E. (1983). Special education practitioners as consumers and producers of research: A hierarchy of competencies. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 4(3), 8-17.

Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1989). Building the future. In D. K. Lipsky & A. Gartner (Eds.), Beyond separate education: Quality education for all. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

MacMillan, D. L., Keogh, B. K., & Jones, R. L. (1986). Special education research on mildly handicapped learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 686-724). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Reich, R. B. (1990). Education and the next economy. In S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), Education reform: Making sense of it all (pp. 19-212). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Reynolds, M. C., & Wang, M. C. (1983). Restructuring "special" school programs: A position paper. Policy Studies Review, 2(1), 189-212.

Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and general education. Exceptional Children, 53, 391-398.

Sarason, S. B. (1983). Schooling in America: Scapegoat or salvation. New York: Free Press.

Schlechty, P. C. (1990). Schools for the 21st century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Semmel, M. I. (1987). Special education in the year 2000 and beyond: A proposed action agenda for addressing selected ideas. In H. R. Prehm (Ed.), The future of special education. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 3-36). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Sirotnik, K. A., & Clark, R. W. (1988). School-centered decision making and renewal. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(9), 660-664.

Skrtic, T. M. (1987). The national inquiry into the future of education for students with special needs. Counterpoint, 4(7), 6.

Skrtic, T. M. (1988). The crisis in special education knowledge. In E. Meyen & T. Skrtic (Eds.), Exceptional children and youth: An introduction (3rd ed.) (pp. 415-448). Denver, CO: Love.

Skrtic, T. M. (1991). Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization. Denver, CO: Love.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1991). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51(2), 102-111.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Thousand, J. (1990). Organizational perspectives on teacher education and renewal: A conversation with Tom Skrtic. Teacher Education and Special Education, 13, 30-35.

Wittrock, M. C. (Ed.). (1986). Handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Developing Teacher Researchers: Preservice and Inservice Considerations

Mark A. Koorland
The Florida State University

The reform movement in both general and special education has called for restructuring education. The emphasis in reform is the shift from inputs such as books and types of courses offered, to outputs, such as achievement and student knowledge. Reform also calls for new activities and roles for teachers such as identifying practices necessary to achieve school goals and participating in staff development, including conducting inservice for peers and helping to collect and interpret evaluation data related to improvement goals (Caldwell & Wood, 1988).

Teachers will be asked to perform a broader range of roles than perhaps ever before. With the movement to make schools a central part of the community, teachers now may play coordination roles among social, vocational, and health services. Often, teachers are asked to assume administrative and leadership duties that come with experience and their particular expertise (e.g., computer or early childhood knowledge). And, special educators must interact more closely with parents and collaborate with general educators. These facets of a teacher's responsibilities are obviously time and labor intensive. The important role of the researcher will emerge as reform asks teachers to participate in site based management, program development, and process and product evaluation. Inevitably, teacher training and support systems must respond to reform's challenges.

Defining the Issue

If new roles for both general and special educators include understanding data, focusing on outcomes evaluation, and participating in site based change (Caldwell & Wood, 1988), then the notion of teachers as researchers, often called for by professionals in special education (Lewis & Blackhurst,1983; Nevin, Paolucci-Whitcomb, Duncan, & Thibodeau, 1982; Newcomer, 1982; Rose, 1981), becomes ever more relevant to reform. IHE's and LEA's both have an important contribution to make if there is serious commitment to training and supporting the kind of teacher that possesses technical skills needed for the nineties. If development of teacher researchers is worthwhile, why are there few such teachers now, and how might we develop and support such a professional in the future? The purpose of this paper is to speculate about the answers.

Research is conducted for a number of purposes and by a number of methods. Bay (1992) discusses the notion of action research and points to its value in improving the educational process. Action research serves the purpose to provide immediate answers to problems. While the other purposes of research--basic, applied, evaluation and research and development--can be useful to schools, it is the need to answer immediate questions that often prompts teachers and administrators to seek assistance.

Various research methods are useful for teachers and administrators. Qualitative methods such as historic research may address why a particular school policy or procedure came to be. Descriptive research, such as parent opinions, obtained by personal

interviews, or surveys about topics planned for a parent/teacher organization meeting provides information about the status of a subject. Correlational research may provide answers about what events occur together, such as school absenteeism and rate of office referrals for misbehavior. The causal/comparative or experimental method permits answering questions about what treatment shows the greatest change in students, or which of two teaching methods is most effective. While determination of the "cause" of a phenomenon is the most complex of the research problems, determination of causal or functional relationships may be the most relevant to evaluating teacher controlled treatments.

Why Don't Teachers Research: Some IHE Obstacles and Solutions

In IHE's we speak often of the value of teacher researchers, yet we do not train many teachers who claim vigorously to value research or try it in their classroom or community setting. Perhaps a number of things that we do contribute to the lack of faith in research or a passing interest in it.

Teach Teachers Validated Methods

First, we must look at what we tell our students. The techniques and teaching strategies we endorse frequently lack support, either qualitative or quantitative, or only demonstrate marginal efficacy. For example, there is a sizable commitment to the whole language approach in education. However, Stahl and Miller (1989) point to recent studies showing stronger comparative effects for basal reading approaches. Additionally, current research does not support whole language use

with disadvantaged readers. When teacher trainers endorse a particular instructional approach, do they point to studies that accompany the approach? The answer is unknown. But teacher trainers should be cautioned to model, for preservice teachers, that in IHE's research is valued and it guides our curricular prerogatives.

Teach Your Teachers Well

Some schools require an undergraduate introductory research course for teachers and others require it at the beginning graduate level. This is commendable, but who should teach these courses? Are the most effective instructors chosen? If we want teachers to react positively to research, then we must carefully assign faculty, employing those enthusiastic instructors who are sensitive to the politics and policies of the schools, to deliver both qualitative and quantitative research competencies.

Do we teach teachers how to read their own literature as part of research courses? The answer to this varies across universities, if not from instructor to instructor. In research courses, it is common to require that students generate a practice research proposal or literature review. However, the skill we should value, at least equally, is reading the literature and making judgments about its believability and usefulness, so ultimately teachers may translate results into practice. The time devoted to developing research reading and appraisal skills should be a large part of introductory research courses for teachers.

Know Your Constituency

IHE's need to engage in qualitative research and ask teachers why they do or do not engage in classroom research or research reading to seek solutions to classroom problems. The author interviewed a beginning graduate research class for teachers about perceived obstacles to reading and conducting research. The responses obtained were both enlightening and worrisome. The respondents enrolled in an urban university, all reported that they do not have the time to conduct research. This is an understandable response. A few stated it is not part of their job responsibility. This information reflects more traditional teacher roles; however, in the future research may be part of a teacher's job description. Interestingly, some said they thought the companies selling tests and materials had thoroughly researched their products and there was no need for teachers to do it--an unfortunate assumption to make, given the history of some pharmaceutical companies and their products and the history of some commonly employed tests and remediation techniques in special education.

Other class members said that easy access to a research library or professional journal was not available. This could be remedied. But, the most nettlesome response came from many who said that the state and county dictate what and how they must teach. So, if they determined that a particular technique or curriculum was successful, but it violated district policy, then they felt it would be perceived as "bucking" the system. This last response was disheartening. LEA's must participate in supporting teachers as innovators and questioners of currently popular or endorsed teaching methods, otherwise teachers

will view themselves simply as employees following directions. It is certainly not the professional image of active participation in school reform called for by policy leaders.

What Can LEA's Do?

Demand More from Vendors

Research information rarely accompanies the materials or teacher's purchase. Unfortunately, validation is often assumed by consumers of the myriad of materials. Even when salespeople claim that the material or testing/teaching package is validated, some form of primary evidence should be offered. Recently, for example, controversy over learning styles has surfaced. Claims have been made for the efficacy of this commercially marketed system, while in reality the research base is highly questionable (Snider, 1992). Perhaps schools could develop a quality control coordinator position at the central office to investigate product reviews or conduct validation studies. Informed opinions could be made available to principals and teachers anticipating purchases. Large school sites could have their own coordinator. The position could rotate among faculty and provide release time to research and evaluate various educational products. If research information about methods is readily available, teachers will become informed and more critical consumers.

Seek Available Resource Personnel

Many university faculty are quite willing to assist and advise LEA teachers or past students encountering instructional difficulties or when teachers desire to study school-wide needs. For faculty, especially junior faculty seeking research activities, such partnerships

would be quite valued. Teachers can invite faculty to local professional meetings and set aside time for roundtable problem solving or discussion of the latest research. Faculty should invite teachers to talk to preservice classes about their classroom challenges, and those exchanges could generate researchable topics. Programs with advanced graduate training are in an excellent position to form research partnerships with teachers. Stevens, Bott, Slaton, and Bunney (1992) found that teachers participating in a collaborative research effort with university faculty reported benefits of increased awareness of effective instructional practices, ability to perform better, and a supportive atmosphere for problem solving.

Teachers and Principals Need to Talk

In a recent interview with the CEO of a small, but surprisingly successful steel mill in Ohio, the CEO was asked to what did the company attribute its success, especially since the steel industry is depressed in the United States. The CEO replied, "We talk to each other around here." Each level of management feels free to talk among themselves and to workers, and workers feel free to talk to management. The result is problem resolution while efficiency is encouraged, and the company is a standout in an otherwise highly troubled industry.

Schools in the past have encouraged quality circles in which teachers could cooperatively work toward school improvement (Hunnicutt, 1987). Site based, research driven quality circles could be formed so teachers have the opportunity (and the job responsibility along with administrative support) to explore genuinely validated

strategies to improve classroom practice, or to employ reflection and questioning to develop understanding of school processes (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Teams are able to use each member's unique skills and prompt movement toward changes that the public demands in reform. At the district level, support for research based problem resolution and school improvement could be provided. For example, district offices send numerous memos to teachers and staff yearly. An LEA could produce regularly circulating research into practice memos as well as memos describing reflections of teachers implementing site-based management or ungraded primary classes. Teachers could contribute and receive recognition or even points toward certification renewal. An idea for the first issue of the school year might be "verbal strategies for defusing teacher-student confrontation"--it would probably attract wide readership.

Make Data of All Kinds Part of the School Culture

Principals and teachers can be trained (and many teachers are trained now) in relatively easy measurement techniques such as direct, daily, and repeated student performance measures characteristic of curriculum based measurement that would permit comparison of teaching strategies, or evaluation of outcomes among students in the academic and social domains. In the qualitative domain teachers could be trained in methods for gathering field notes, field work relations and analysis after data gathering. Follow-up studies from past graduates can provide insights incredibly useful for changing school policies and teaching practices. Teachers are often in the best position

to locate and interview past students, especially those who stay in contact with their teachers.

It is true, time is at a premium for teachers, but many interested persons want to share their time to make schools better places. Volunteers can be sought at PTA meetings and from the community at large to assist specifically in measurement and recording activities. Universities often employ local school systems as practicum sites. Every preservice teacher should have a measurement component as part of their practicum. Preservice teachers, in general, and special educators should practice obtaining repeated brief performance samples in basic skills of both general and special education students and in studying the culture of the school.

Preservice and inservice teachers should be at ease with qualitative and basic quantitative data gathering. Even young learners can help with recording performances or interviewing to determine student perceptions of school processes. At the very least, young students would see that teachers value systematic inquiry and observation. If data based opinions become the preferred basis for solutions to school problems, then an important part of school reform will be in place.

References

Bagdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Caldwell, S. D., & Wood, F. H. (1988). School-based improvement--Are we ready? Educational Leadership, 46 , 50-53.

Gay, L. R. (1992). Educational research (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Hunnicutt, D. (1987). Improving education through quality circles. Contemporary Education, 58(3), 138-140.

Lewis, R. B., & Blackhurst, A. E. (1983). Special education practitioners as consumers and producers of research: A hierarchy of competencies. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 4(3), 8-17.

Nevin, A., Paolucci-Whitcomb, D., & Thibodeau, L. A. (1982). The consulting teacher as a clinical researcher. Teacher Education And Special Education, 5(4), 19-29.

Newcomer, P. L. (1982). Competencies for professionals in learning disabilities. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 5, 241-252.

Rose, T. L. (1981). Deliver education through research. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 14(6), 342-343.

Stevens, K.B., Bott-Slaton, D., & Bunney, S.(1992). A collaborative research effort between public school and university faculty members. Teacher Education and Special Education, 15, 1-8.

Snider,V. E. (1992). Learning styles and learning to read: A critique. Remedial and Special Education, 13, 6-18.

Stahl, S. A., & Miller, P. D. (1989). Whole language and language experience approaches for beginning reading: A quantitative research synthesis. Review of Educational Research, 59, 87-116.

Perspectives on School-Based Practice Research Needs

Diane Baumgart
University of Idaho

Gail Bornfield
Minot State University

The issues of school reform and restructuring were topics of the Leadership Forum in Washington, D.C. during April, 1992. A group of professionals met after the Forum speakers to discuss and generate issues that need to impact research in this area within the next decade. The issues that this group identified are reported here with a short discussion of each provided by the authors.

Defining the Issues

This group of about 30 professionals met for about a 2 hour interval to describe and define issues for future research. The group consisted of University faculty in Special Education or Educational Administration, state and national agency administrators, a director of a University Affiliated Program, and a former project officer for OSEP. Absent from the group were families of students with disabilities and/or local school district leaders and teachers. The group was charged with identifying issues in the field of school-based research, barriers to further research and implementation of findings, and potential solutions to identified barriers. A group facilitator engaged the group in the process; the assistant facilitator took copious notes while the group listed issues on large paper for all group members to discuss and define.

Three major themes emerged from the group discussion and each had a number of sub-themes. The notes under each theme are those of the facilitator and are taken from notes of the group discussion, with further clarification added as needed in the judgment of the authors.

Theme One: Research needs to focus on the process of change, in addition to outcomes achieved, and methods used.

Sub-themes

There are many underlying assumptions that drive current research and reform efforts. Unfortunately, many of them remain unexamined or contradict each other, fundamental understanding of system change and school restructuring. Research efforts should ferret out the assumptions underlying reform efforts, critique and evaluate their impact on stated reform outcomes, and discuss competing assumptions and their respective messages.

Site-based management and National Testing Programs are two widespread reform/restructuring efforts that should be researched. Their underlying assumptions, the processes used to support change, and the respective outcomes and methods of study all deserve concerted research efforts.

Past research has demonstrated not only that schools can change but that the changes effected are often not maintained. Research efforts focused on barriers to sustaining change are needed, along with flexible tools that can readily accommodate studies on the processes and outcomes of changing systems.

Research efforts directed toward the systems change process require alternatives to traditional, standard tools. These tools and models of "change" research must attend to the complexity of classroom cultures and school cultures within the process and expected outcomes of such studies.

Results and methods of research studies should include more information on the participants of the process (e.g., previous change efforts and their success, relationship of school and university in past efforts, energy and enthusiasm of participants, philosophical perspectives) and reflect upon the effect of these factors within the discussion section.

The issue of generalization must be revisited and redefined. Generalization and replication efforts must be distinguished from imitation efforts. The individuality and culture of educational systems must somehow be more readily explicated within the definition and use of generalization and replication efforts.

Theme Two: Research efforts in dissemination need to be enhanced and redesigned.

Sub-themes

Research dissemination needs to become more of a mandate within at least those projects that are supported by federal and state funds. Descriptions and outcomes of funded research often are not disseminated to a wide audience. Research efforts should have a minimal requirement to disseminate to identified data bases and/or networks, including professional and other consumers of the outcomes.

Research on how best to market research findings and products that are readily consumable is needed. Audiences, beyond the typical higher education and professional consumers, needs to be identified and targeted.

Theme Three: Successful collaboration efforts in higher education to prepare educators who can teach all children need to become more of a research focus. In addition, barriers to successful collaboration and outcomes need to be identified and described.

Research efforts on processes, strategies and barriers for the merging or infusion of regular and special education content need to become a priority.

Innovative partnerships with districts and schools need to become more of a research effort/priority, and models and systems for collaborative research and participatory research endeavors needs to be explained and explored, both between regular and special education personnel preparation programs, and between these programs and districts.

The relationships of research areas and categorical funding and certification need to be explored regarding duplication of efforts across different populations and overlap of findings not explored across populations.

The preparation of personnel to "teach all children" needs to be explored, along with models of collaboration and system structures that support such efforts at the higher education level, as well as the school level. Expertise outside of school buildings and higher education departments/divisions should be described as a functioning system.

Philosophy, Differences, and Education

Diane Baumgart*
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

The past decade has witnessed a plethora of changes in the content and structure of programs for persons with severe disabilities. The developmental approach as the sole basis for determining "what to teach" was replaced and eventually integrated with a functional, ecological, and activity-based approach. In addition, instructional strategies have expanded beyond the direct instructional approach to include incidental teaching and the use of natural cues and correction procedures. The structure of programs identified as models of "best practice" has changed from separate schools to integrated placements within regular age-appropriate schools, and currently to full-inclusion models where relationships, rather than interactions, can be supported. Within the logic of these changes there is a focus on the rights of students with disabilities, their entitlement as people to services, and a continual struggle to eradicate the second class (and even third class) citizen status so prevalent in the past.

The Problem

Many of the changes in the structure and content of what comprises "best practices" are heralded by some as needed and necessary changes. Others view these changes as movements which threaten to relegate learning to the back seat in favor of image enhancement or opportunities for social interactions. A third position, and one I wish to expand upon, posits that many

critics and advocates of inclusion and other restructuring movements are often supporting strategies for students based on either an entitlement or different person philosophic assumption. These philosophic assumptions have resulted in great strides forward in services and quality-of-life issues for those with disabilities. In spite of the past successes resulting from these positions, these assumptions are actually barriers to "best practice" implementation. Works by Skrtic (1987, 1991), Minnow (1988, 1990), Sarason (1990), and Shellecty (1990) posit that current structures and restructuring efforts are deeply embedded within assumptions that, if revisited, would most likely not be embraced. It is an analysis of philosophic assumptions that has in part supported past practices and must accompany current restructuring and "best practice" efforts. Current positions of the different person and the entitlement or rights perspective will be discussed along with the dilemma their use appears to have created. An alternative perspective, one of social relations, is then proposed and is used to guide solutions for two common difficulties in serving children who may be challenged with severe difficulties.

A Review of Two Philosophic Perspectives

Many scholars, including Rawls (1971), Blatt, Biklen, and Bogden (1977), Sarason and Doris (1979), Gould (1981), Douglas (1986), and Hahn (1987) have discussed the implications of viewing any disability as solely a difference. This perspective, called here the "different person perspective," holds that

differences reside within a person and are inherent and immutable. Its implications within services for students with disabilities still linger. Diagnostic tests and practices designed to discover this inherent difference as well as separate services, separate classrooms and separate schools are remnants of the best intentions of this perspective.

A second perspective, the "rights perspective," as it is called here, holds that at least initially, all people must be viewed as people that are the same. That is, as people they are entitled to the same rights and privileges, services, and outcomes as others in spite of their differences. Although this perspective initially ignores the differences, it revisits and affirms differences in order to advocate for appropriate services. Thus, both the rights perspective and the different person perspective, result in what is termed by Minnow (1990) as the dilemma of differences. This dilemma is epitomized as a struggle to treat people differently, without stigmatizing them, or a struggle to treat them the same, without denying them assistance. Each perspective raises a serious question and results in a dilemma: when does providing special services in schools emphasize the differences of the children and, thus, stigmatize and hinder them on that basis? When does providing the same services and treating students the same become insensitive to their differences and, thus, stigmatize or hinder them on that basis?

The continual use of these perspectives to drive and shape, even in part, current restructuring and best practice efforts need to be questioned. The problems of inequality in education can be

exacerbated by both treating individuals as members of a category (e.g., ability level, race, gender, language type, or religion) the same as members of the majority and by treating them as inherently different. Consider the proponents and opponents of inclusion. In most cases, where the argument for or against this new best practice is discussed, the dilemma of differences emerges. The result of partial integration is poignantly described by Schnorr (1990) where other students describe a student with disabilities only as "Peter, he comes and he goes." The full-inclusion result for a student Rachael (Board of Education of Sacramento v. Holland, 1992) although positive, still carries with it a stigma. In making its decision the court focused on the learning needs of Rachael (academic and nonacademic) and potential detriments of Rachael's presence to others. In effect, Rachael was viewed as the same as other students in terms of having a legal right to education, but as inherently different from all other students in terms of her learning needs. What isn't addressed in either the court case or these philosophical perspectives are the different and similar learning needs of Rachael's classmates. If a student named Rachael can benefit from this placement, how can teachers collaborate to ensure all students benefit from a new class composition? If Rachael needs adaptations, is she the only student who could benefit from changes in how learning is enhanced? These later questions can be more readily addressed within a new perspective.

A New Perspective and Its Implications

This discussion about philosophy is not an attempt to choose between the rights or different person perspective, or to deny that each has offered support for needed changes and services for many. The services afforded students in the above cases are seen as positive. They are also seen as limiting. What is being questioned is the continual use of these assumptions in driving and supporting current and future changes in services and best practices. A way out is discussed by social relations philosophers; it is a challenge to our assumptions about the existence of an objective, neutral perspective, and a challenge to the existence of majority norms, status quo, and solely intrinsic differences.

What are the assumptions? The perspective of social relations (drawn from theories developed and expanded since the 1920s) assumes that there are similarities between people (as does the rights and different person perspective). It also rejects social organizations that categorize relationships and characteristics in immutable categories, fixed status, and inherited or ascribed traits. Within this perspective, we assume that people live, talk, and know in relationships and time. Thus, differences are understood as relationships and are meaningful only in terms of comparison. These relationships (and whether they are valued or devalued) are expected to change with time and historical perspective. The relations are also expected to change as the comparison changes on some trait or in relation to some norm. One is short only in comparison to tall and one may be non-

ambulatory only in comparison to people in environments without ramps and wide entrances. Thus, this approach challenges the belief that differences reside totally within a person or group and offers the view that programs, laws, codes and regulations, and best practices should be designed by encompassing the connectedness of each group on an issue. An example, where the category of gender was initially used to design a program, and then reconstructed using the social relations philosophy, is offered to clarify the use of this perspective.

Maternity leave was the subject of a number of law suits in the 1980s. The rights perspective might support maternity leave because of a woman's right to work. The different person perspective might support the leave because women are different from men and, thus, should have this special privilege. Both perspectives could result in women being stigmatized as different (too different to be hired for jobs) or result in standards that ignore differences (equate workers and satisfactory performance with norms established historically by males). A case on this issue which clearly differentiates itself in its use of the social relations perspective (Minnow, 1988) discussed the difficulties with focusing on gender as the controversy and discussed the outcomes that result when the focus is upon connectedness between employees. A decision to establish parental leaves and allow women, as well as men, to have families without losing jobs was the result. This idea could be expanded to allow employees to take a family leave to care for infants, adopted children, mates, and elderly parents. In addition to its innovative focus on social

relations, rather than gender differences, this court addressed the issue of comparison of some group to the majority, or a norm, and the difficulty with leaving a norm based on differences in place. In this case, leaving the male employee norm in place would make women and pregnancy different by comparison and would emphasize the power of the norm group in establishing policies, procedures, and practices. This same dependence on a norm (general education as the status quo) and the resulting design of best practices based on differences are what courts and some researchers are relying on to support and research inclusion and other innovative practices. Couldn't this in part account for difficulties in gaining wide-spread implementation? Couldn't this reliance on the rights and different person perspective partially account for the mainstreaming of students with mild challenges to be referred to as "dumping?" Isn't this later perspective more resonant with school restructuring and the education of all children? A review of inclusion might highlight a needed shift in perspectives.

The proponents of inclusion and integration (see Giangreco and Putnam, 1991, for a review) note positive outcomes when implementation includes specially designed instruction, structured and unstructured social contact, and a feeling of ownership by the general education teacher for the student with severe disabilities. Both proponents and opponents note that certain classroom environments are not optimal, and those that are usually have a cooperative learning climate, use a variety of curricular approaches (adapted, multilevel, or overlapping curriculum), and use people resources in a coordinated and collaborative. Even in

optimal classroom environments, the difference of the student with the disability remains a focus, and the connectedness of this student with other students remains unaddressed. In effect, this type of inclusion or integration will continue to stigmatize students with severe disabilities and reinforce a ceiling effect on the positive outcomes achieved and hoped for. This "portable" (Roncker v. Walter, 1983) service delivery description reaffirms the status quo of general education, distinct and different perspectives of special education, distinct and different perspectives of general education, distinct and different perspectives of general and special education, and the current organization/structure of general education as natural and permanent. Some practitioners and families do question this status quo and ask: Why would I want to send my student/child to this classroom when I don't think any student should have to learn that way? Others are questioning a model which relies on more resources at a time of stringent reductions (Ferguson, Baumgart, Meyer, 1992). The two examples below exemplify what can happen when teachers and families collaborate and review the needs of all students within a social relations perspective. The primary challenges addressed were first, resources and staffing and, second, meeting students' needs based on strengths and weaknesses of all children.

A school district in a western state made a commitment to serve all its students within the district and began the process of serving students within district and neighborhood schools. One elementary school was observed during this process by a team of

researchers, including one author of this paper. During the summer, class assignments had been organized so that all students would be able to begin the day in a general education homeroom, based on their chronological age. A special educator had been hired to assist in implementing inclusion, and teachers had attended workshops on inclusion and collaboration. Throughout the year, I observed a group of fifth graders as they problem solved on issues and observed in their classrooms as they implemented various ideas. One issue that arose early in the year was the number of interruptions that occurred with students being "pulled out" and "included." Teachers felt these transitions were disruptive to the class as a whole and to the individual students who moved. A second issue was the lack of "special" ownership of students receiving special services. The specialized staff felt that they were "just tutoring" kids and that they were not effective in assisting students to adjust to large group instruction. A third issue was raised by one of the fifth grade teachers. She discussed eight students in her classroom who were all "very disruptive," and she needed assistance with these students "more than" she needed assistance with students receiving special education or Chapter One services. The three teachers, two general education fifth grade teachers, and a special education "self-contained" teacher, realized after various discussions that moving students in and out was based on labels and past practices. Since these movements were identified as problems anyway, they brainstormed on how to deliver instruction based on the needs of all kids to learn and remain members of this fifth grade community. By mid-October

the teachers had designed an instructional pilot plan that was implemented between November and mid-January. The students in special education, including those with severe disabilities, and all students in the fifth grade classrooms were regrouped. The students started the day in their assigned homerooms and then, for the the next two instructional hours, were assigned to one of four heterogeneous groups of 8-12 students who rotated through instruction conducted by a fifth grade teacher, the special education teacher from the former "self-contained" room, and an instructional aide. Students received instruction in one of the fifth grade classrooms, the now vacant special education classroom, and the computer lab. The settlement of the early colonies was the instructional content, and each group spent 30 minutes in each of the rooms building a three-dimensional replica of a colonial settlement, designing and crafting early-American home furnishings, studying the settlement laws and rewriting laws for their colony using calligraphy, and writing out a daily journal on their project in the computer lab. The teaching expertise was available to the students during the rotation as before (30 minutes of special education per student), opportunities for social interaction and community membership were enhanced, behavioral disruptions were minimized with the dispersal of the eight into different groups and with small class sizes, all teachers taught, all students made gains, and movements of students did not disrupt teaching. In this instance the discovery of an unnecessary organizational norm for delivering services, the collaboration of teachers prompted by the district "inclusion" mandate, and the need

for all teachers to own teaching prompted these teachers to design an innovative plan to serve all students. None of the students were "pulled out," all students' membership needs were acknowledged, and all student outcomes were enhanced within this social relations perspective for designing instruction.

A second example is the provision of bilingual/bicultural education by elementary school personnel in a rural western district. Rather than designate the new influx of Hispanic students as "different" because they did not speak and comprehend English, all elementary students were viewed in terms of their differences (speaking different languages and having different cultures from each other) and in terms of their connectedness and similarities (all could benefit from learning a second language). The services for the first year were designed so that all students could learn a second language. English was used for instruction in the morning and Spanish was used for instruction in the afternoon. The addition of a second language to the curriculum had been requested in the past, but until the influx of Spanish speaking students, this had not been affordable. In this example the structure and provision of services was within a social relations perspective and provided a contrast in its structure to typical pull-out bilingual/bicultural education models and in its benefits to all students.

In summary, the social relations theory provides another perspective upon which to design and implement services. In many ways this perspective resonates well with school reform and restructuring advocates who question the current structures of schools and their hierarchical, categorical organization. Whether

or not researchers and practitioners identify and reflect upon this perspective may be a critical factor in whether reforms and best practices, excellence, and equity are finally realized to a greater extent in public education . . . for all children.

References

Blatt, B., Biklen, D., Bogden, R. (Eds.). (1977). An alternative textbook in special education. Denver: Love Publishing Co.

Douglas, M. (1986). How institutions think. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Ferguson, D., Baumgart, D., Meyer, G. (1992). Fieldnotes from a qualitative study: A pretty good elementary school changes. Unpublished raw data.

Giangreco, M., & Putnam, J. W. (1991). Supporting the education of students with severe disabilities in regular education environments. In L. H. Meyer, C. A. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds.), Critical issues in the lives of people with severe disabilities (pp. 245-270). Baltimore: Paul Brookes.

Gould, S. J. (1981). The mismeasure of man. New York: Norton.

Hahn, H. (1987). Public policy and disabled infants: A sociopolitical perspective. Issues in Law and Medicine, 3(1), 3-7.

Minnow, M. (1988). Feminist reason: Getting it and losing it. Journal of Legal Education, 38(1 and 2), 47-60.

Minnow, M. (1990). Making all the difference: Inclusion, exclusion, and American law. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Rawls, J. (1971). A theory of justice. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sarason, S. B., & Doris, J. (1979). Educational handicap, public policy, and social history: A broadened perspective on mental retardation. New York: The Press.

Schnorr, R. F. (1990). "Peter? He comes and goes . . .": First graders' perspectives on a part-time mainstream student. The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15(4), 231-241.

Schlechty, P. C. (1990). Schools for the 21st century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Skrtic, T. M. (1987). An organizational analysis of special education reform: National inquiry into the future of education for students with special needs. Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Skrtic, T. M. (1991). Beyond special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization. Denver: Love Publishing Co.

*The contributions of this author were solely in her private capacity. No official suport or endorsement by the University of Idaho is intended or should be inferred.

A Consultant's Use of Qualitative Methods in Implementing Systems Change: A Snapshot of a Ridgeview High School Program in Special Education

Diane Baumgart*
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

Systems change. These words have been the focus of research efforts and funding over the years. In spite of many laudable outcomes, concerns have surfaced in the literature. New tools for assessing and monitoring the process of change, along with participation of personnel involved in the process of change are needed to capture the mirage of changes that occur in the complex culture and climate of schools and classrooms. Traditional research tools, with an almost exclusive reliance on quantifiable measures, have proven unsatisfactory in measuring and evaluating many of these changes. Suggestions for capturing these changes have been suggested, and some attempts have been made to use qualitative tools and/or combinations of qualitative and quantitative methods (Ferguson, Jeanchild, & Carter, 1991; Ferguson, Ferguson, & Taylor, 1992).

A second concern is the discrepancy between commonly accepted best practice indicators and their widespread implementation in the field. This issue has been documented along with messages that research and commitment need to address reasons for the discrepancy and solutions to current barriers (Putnam & Bruininks, 1986; Hill, Seyfarth, Banks, Wehman, & Orlove, 1987; Meyer, Eichinger, & Park-Lee, 1986). One strategy recommended for supporting and monitoring systems change, that

may also assist in the process of decreasing and/or understanding the discrepancy noted above, is the use of quantitative evaluation methods to identify critical and idiosyncratic variables particular to systems that are undergoing changes. In this way the culture of the system and the climate for change can be included as a variable that supports or inhibits certain kinds of outcomes.

An effort to implement systems change in a secondary program is the subject of this paper. The purpose and data collection process of the report are described. All references to the actual school and personnel have been changed in this paper. The report was submitted to personnel (teachers, instructional aides, administrators), and their reactions and issues were used to direct systems change. The initial reactions of personnel, as well as reactions of the consultants, are shared along with the report below.

A Snapshot of a High School Program

In the winter of 1992 a special education teacher, with the support of the consulting teacher and special education administrator, submitted a proposal for a range of changes and related outcomes in the area of secondary/vocational and transitions practices. The proposal was reviewed by the funding agency and approved for support. After numerous discussions and reviews of the changes and outcomes with the consulting teacher, vocational teacher, and administrator, the consultant and the special education director reframed the purpose and methods of support for the project. Rather than proceed with outlines of

changes and measures of implementation (e.g., number of students supervised on the job, wages earned), the teachers would work with the consultant to describe their current program and provide their suggestions and critiques of what existed. The report would provide the personnel with an outsider's glimpse of them and their program and raise questions, which they would address. From the perspective in the report, reviewed over the summer, the teachers and administrators would outline team directions for changes and strategies to effect changes. It was discussed at the onset that this initial evaluation might change the priorities from what were in the initial proposal. There was some hesitation on the part of the vocational teacher to change, but also a willingness to proceed. All changes were cleared with the funding agency.

Beginning the Observations and Interviews

As I walked up the steps of Ridgeview High School I found myself saying, "Now this is a high school!" The building was substantial, with stone steps and large, heavy doors that open into an entrance way. The students who walked out the doors during this change of classes seemed almost like a poster for America 2000 . . . smiling, talking, some arm in arm. The haze of drugs and cat calls I have waded through in so many other high schools were noticeably absent.

The first stop was at the office to check in with the principal, Tom Wittworth, to introduce myself, Debra (a second consultant), and the project. The office atmosphere was casual, matching the first impression of the school. It took an effort to introduce

ourselves to the office person at the typewriter, who ignored office traffic and congestion, to have her locate the principal for our meeting. Sitting in the hall outside the principal's office and watching the ebb and flow of office traffic confirmed the previous impressions of a casual atmosphere. The meeting with Tom Wittworth was invigorating and interesting. His presence was felt immediately through his firm handshake, smile, and direct and friendly style. The introductions were made and the agenda reviewed: We would listen to teachers, probe, observe, and offer a picture of the special education program for later review and discussion. We decided to communicate by memo, as needed, since the dates of observations were not confirmed and Tom's spring schedule required substantial travel.

We began a tour of classes and work sites and interviews with teachers and instructional assistants. I conducted classroom observations and teacher and staff interviews while Debra visited students on work sites and met with the job coach. Our agenda was simple. In the brief amount of time left in the spring semester we would collect a snapshot of the Ridgeview special education program and teachers, including their anticipated changes and concerns. In the course of seven days, within approximately a month, we gathered perspectives on the program, climate, and instruction. We talked with all teachers, usually for about an hour, observed all classrooms and took careful notes, and visited eight work sites to observe different students. We taped and transcribed the interviews with teachers. In addition, we transcribed our fieldnotes from observations and casual discussions with

instructional staff, from a group meeting, and from phone contacts. The account I share below is our impression and understanding about the Ridgeview High School special education program during a relatively brief glimpse.

During the course of our observations the comfortable and casual atmosphere of the school and special education program did not diminish. It doesn't take a visitor long to pick up on the genuine concern for students felt by teachers and to notice the disabilities experienced by the students. The openness of most teachers never dimished during our observations, but we soon saw concerns and tensions wearing and pulling at them and the parts of the program. In fact, the image of the program began to appear as one of many disjointed parts--some excellent--that needed to be connected and fine tuned.

Changes in the Program

The special education program had undergone a number of changes over the past seven or eight years. These included a new director of special education, a new principal, three new teachers (one within the last year), a new consulting teacher model, curriculum expansion to include students with more severe challenges into classes and vocational preparation, adapted classes for students on the academic track, and a junior high to senior high transition process. In the words of one teacher, "We are always doing something new. We never remain the same from year to year." Some changes applied to schedules that were arranged and rearranged each year to meet the academic needs of students.

Other changes seemed to be more pervasive in their scope and infusion in the program.

The most impressive change, and one mentioned by all teachers, was the transition process as students moved from the junior to the senior high. Each teacher described the process and information as useful in formatting the high school program for students. The parental input into the process was also emphasized. The value of the process and information seemed apparent, and two teachers offered detailed examples of how the information was used. They also expressed the desire to make the best decisions for students, given the graduation restraints and time limitations. In addition, one teacher described the out-of-school transition and its value as a process to prepare a transition document and guide instruction to achieve outcomes in the transition plan. The clarity of this discussion and the genuine concern for students expressed by this teacher were repeated themes in the drive to improve. Other teachers seemed to view the transition document and process with the junior high as an outline for high school classes. I had questions about their use of the process to plan for success in life. Most indicated little information regarding follow-up contact with graduates, beyond some incidental conversations with former students who returned to school for a visit, or who teachers encountered in the community.

Another theme, time pressures and conflicts between college preparation, graduation, and work preparation emerged as an ongoing concern during the whole visit. Teachers expressed a need for students to begin an academic track the first year of high

school if students wanted to receive a regular high school diploma. These teachers also felt that most students would benefit from the content of the careers classes and the community-based-vocational program. Teachers noted that some students in academic classes were not learning much. All teachers noted that most students wanted to leave school and graduate at age 18.

Other changes and aspects of the program seemed to be in the state of emergence rather than full implementation. These included the offering of the study skills class, adapted and/or co-taught classes for regular and special education students, resource room and life skills, and the coordination and scope and sequence of career and work exploration. In most cases, lack of full implementation was not a result of inadequate attention from individual teachers and administration, but rather a result of probing questions and concerns generated by some teachers, parents, and other instructional staff, as well as a lack of time to "really think through changes and directions." Changes in teaching staff and perspectives have also had an impact. A new teacher is being hired for the students with more severe challenges, and teachers expressed hesitation to plan too much before this person was a known quantity. It was impressive to see most teachers, immersed in working with students, still generating ideas toward the improvement of the program. Suggestions were rooted in concerns for students and the preparation of these students for post-secondary life and careers. As one teacher stated:

> I don't want a kid to come back and say, "You know I decided I wanted to be a police officer and I can't go because I didn't have the right things when I was in high school."

Another teacher voiced a similar concern about adequate preparation:

> If they are going to fail do it here. I mean (if they fail) because of the lack of job skills fail while they are in school so they can be taught what they did wrong instead of graduating them (and having them) going out and failing and getting fired and having no reference after that.

Planning time and multiple demands also limit the implementation. A comment on the need for reflection captures what this team of teachers may be experiencing and what this observer sees as critical:

> When we say we're going to do something the honest (statement) is we don't think and talk things out enough.

A Chance to Listen

Listening and observing afforded an opportunity to congeal many of the hurried expressions of "needs for change" and concerns about "the best for the students" offered by the staff. It was clear to this observer after the first interviews and some observations that the teachers were not "a team" and that they were not clear about how the program components fit or didn't fit together. Those teachers and instructional staff that worked in the same rooms knew the most about each other's program and students' needs. One teacher felt isolated from the group and another teacher felt fine teaching away from their rooms and with minimal contact. In spite of having information about each other's program and students, the

teachers who shared room space had visible difficulty in accepting and/or adapting to each other's teaching style and methods. The group meeting I held was strained. Each teacher seemed more ready to listen to suggestions from an outsider than to express ideas of her or his own. The discussion generated was labored, and I felt teachers were uncomfortable in this situation and held back their ideas, critiques, concerns, and suggestions. It was as if to critique a program was to blame a teacher. One teacher left the meeting without explanation. I left the meeting with a lot of questions. Consensus and majority opinions too often define a team. Could this have been a factor in their reluctance to reflect and discuss? Does "team" refer to an administrative concept or process assumed to operate here? Wass this a group of people in search of their mission and goals together? Was there ever a "team" in this program?

Unlike the group meeting, individual interviews and casual observations revealed talkative teachers with suggestions for major changes and fine tuning the existing program. With a new teacher joining the program in the fall, the timing for reviewing "a team" concept and process was critical. The staff seemed ready to begin the process of more clearly defining how the "team" and program components may or may not have been working. The strategies of the teachers and areas of interest and commitment were diverse. The team process and function will need to be individualized to accommodate this range of skills and interests.

The purpose and focus of study skills were mentioned by three teachers as areas needing review. I observed the atmosphere of these classes as casual and supportive, and yet there is a fine line between constructing this atmosphere and being too lenient and not setting high enough expectations for students. One teacher expressed this frustration and paraphrased another teacher's frustrations:

> We don't do enough. We let them sit and bring their own work in and we let them talk us out of doing stuff like, "We have this to do, can we do it?" That's fine. That's what we're here for, but too much of that is something else.

A review of fieldnotes on study skills classes during this very limited interval, revealed questions were raised about how the class differed from just a study hall. One teacher brainstormed on looking at changes in the class to refocus it as a study hall or a study skills class for all students. Another teacher noted some students didn't need the class. Another noted it could be tied to more hands-on experience in the world of work and teach the same concepts and skills. One teacher questioned why students needed to take it after their sophomore year. The study skills class seemed worth further review and discussion.

A third focus for change was adapting classes and/or mainstreaming students in college preparation coursework. This and graduation requirements raised some interesting and innovative issues. The first issue was the ownership of students and teachers' roles when special education students attended regular classes. Classes discussed were Biology, Government,

English, and History. The latter three have been adapted, and now issues of support arise:

> There is no reason for me to be in Government sitting there waiting to see what's going to happen . . . an aide is sitting over there waiting to see what's going to happen. Or (for me) to go over there at the end of the hour and say, "Is there anything I can run off for you to help?" There is no reason for two teachers to be in there right now. So the aide being over there right now to (do) what is needed. Just to say, "Well, you've done a good job for four years now and you get them all by yourself," would be completely wrong because he does a good job with them.

Two teachers commented at different times that the Government teacher was excellent and the class was going well for students. I wondered why it would be wrong to fade out of this class? Does this Government teacher and other general educators have a perspective to offer?

Observations on the adapted curriculum generated more comments and one teacher noted, "I think as a group we need to do more co-teaching." Another teacher always sent the aide from the room to Health with students to adapt materials and wasn't able to describe the class. Other teachers noted that aides could do the work to a point. In Government, the materials were on tape and some of the adaptations were already set up, so the aide was able to handle the class, and the teacher was excellent. An observation in a Biology class during the week I observed was shared by one teacher during the group discussion:

> Our kids do nothing during a lab when they're dissecting because they were given oral directions. Some wrote them down and some didn't ever get (understand) the directions. I was curious how far they got. (The next day I found out it

> was) about half as far as they said they did. I listened to one of the girls tell somebody in sixth hour how far she had gotten with her fish . . . I went back the next day and it hadn't even been cut open. And it was just a case of not having the help. It wasn't that they couldn't do it. I think (they just need) more direction (and I talked to the teacher) and he wasn't disgusted and he wasn't mad. He just said some of them must really need a lot of help.

During the group exchange and with a study skills teacher ideas were generated about reviewing staffing arrangements and not staying in one "regular" class all year. The exchange in the group revealed that this concept of fading out was a recent idea, and teachers needed more time and assistance to think and reflect on this, as well as a review of their commitment to implement more inclusion/mainstreaming. The group discussion was helpful and began to reveal "habits" of staffing classes that were not necessarily functional anymore.

Along with the issue of more co-teaching, an issue of attitudes of regular educators emerged. The attitudes were described as ranging from, "I don't need help as long as I know what kids I'm getting and where they are at . . . maybe I'll need some materials and assistance with the reading materials. I get paid for doing this for kids," to, "I'll grade and teach my way and if they don't learn the way I teach it, then they flunk it." The participants concluded that there were few of the latter and some exceptional teachers like the first. The issue of other kids in the regular class who could benefit from adapted worksheets and other changes was also raised. How special and regular education teachers co-teach and which kids receive what adaptations and from whom was the issue. This observer saw deeper issues that eventually surfaced--

who owned the kids and how should the teachers get along was one of those issues. Another part of the instructional piece was the students who were 504 eligible. This issue was noted by teachers as potentially having an impact on special education programs. This issue was too large for this project and the special education group to consider. What was evident was these teachers were beginning to discover, in a deeper sense, that co-teaching and inclusion models require a rethinking of students beyond "yours, mine, or ours." Merely saying the words "yours and mine" or "our students" does not get to the fundamental need to reconfigure ownership of students and how teachers need to get along.

Careers classes and work exploration units were curricular areas identified by all teachers and instructional aides as somehow needing expansion and revised sequencing. Teachers concluded that many students needed to be better prepared, needed more "hands on" review of career options, and more supervision. All teachers felt that the option of taking a class earlier (sophomore year) was needed for many students, and a three- or four-week rotation through a variety of work places for a semester prior to placement for a quarter of semester were mentioned by two teachers. One teacher offered detailed ideas about how the rotation could be implemented and why students would benefit from this format. Suggestions for embedding this in the coursework were discussed. I found the description convincing and rooted in an understanding of how students learn and outcomes that should be expected for students and their families. However, it took effort on my part to keep this teacher from getting into

individual student/family crisis in this discussion and losing her thread of thought. Another teacher expressed doubts about the usefulness of in-school resource room and life skills instruction. The conversation did not go much beyond using the words community-based and academics; probing questions were answered on the surface level and graduation requirements were left unaddressed. I found myself asking, as I listened to teachers, "Could the skills of timeliness, responsibility, time management, and note-taking from study skills and the adapted academics be taught within a work or community context? Could the reworking of staffing assignments support more intense supervision and instruction? What teachers could best implement this?"

Observations of seven students on eight job sites over four days indicated that students were not problem solving or carrying out responsibilities as needed. In one instance, a student was working for 15 minutes at a woodshop, watching others for 45 minutes, and getting paid for an hour of work. His response to, "Have you finished your work?" was a phrase about his having just taken out the garbage and thus he was finished. Another student, placed at a day care, was rated as "satisfactory" on her work evaluation and had undertaken appropriate procedures for a planned absence. I wondered if the instruction, beyond what was on the evaluation sheet, had been planned for this student? Another student had completed her dusting and message jobs and hadsupervised and instructed another student with severe challenges. The issue of preparation for a more demanding job might well be an issue for her as well, especially since her job

was at the high school. How can a one-shot placement opportunity fulfill all these issues? At another site the "mistakes" of a student counting out cups of beans could be "practiced" at school. School assessment should determine if mistakes are due to boredom (as hypothesized), skills deficits related to the disability, image problems a student might have with the job, and any number of additional rationale or idiosyncratic reasons. I wondered if any students had instruction directly related to what they could or couldn't do on their job? Appropriate interventions, revising of programs, and coordinated school and work instruction are well within the capabilities of the "careers" teacher and would facilitate student learning. Many aspects of the vocational curricular activities were exceptional, including the use of employer and employee evaluations. Fine tuning would certainly result in an exemplary program for students. Again, with a new teacher entering the program, the impetus for refocusing and refining could begin in the fall.

The Teachers Teach

We were impressed by the atmosphere of caring and support that most teachers and instructional support staff provided for the students. There was not a day that we didn't share some of their frustrations with trying to impress upon young adolescents the importance of learning today in preparation for tomorrow. Conversations of students overheard in classes, "What will you wear tonight?," "I'll get some money and put a muffler on it," "Gonna put straight pipes on it?," "I couldn't find a sub-topic" (a

response after goofing off and being questioned by a watchful teacher), supported the difficulty teachers expressed with refocusing students on the relation of academics (learning) and their future. Each class had students who seemed motivated, needed extra help, and seemed to be less than motivated. Each teacher used different tactics and instructional strategies to respond to students. Most teachers used cooperative learning and heterogeneous grouping and did so effectively. Some, when asked, discussed how they kept track of student progress, and others were not clear on these methods or the criterion. Observations in classes revealed different strategies for handling student responses. In one class, the book Durango Street was read out loud to students. Two students had their books open and seemed to be following along. The remainder of the students had their books closed and heads down on their desks. The teacher asked questions: "What was the social worker trying to do?" and, "This book is old, what would we call them today?" which elicited responses from two students. These two students answered all questions and no attempts were made to involve others. There was no group discussion or written assignment. I left as the teacher continued to read. Other sessions in this class involved students viewing films.

In another class, the teacher handed out assignments for written work and engaged the class in discussions about renting and signing a lease. A group in the back was talking and off-task. The teacher ignored them but walked closer. The students talked out during the session with funny and sometimes appropriate

comments. The teacher laughed with them and then followed up with information that was relevant to reviewing and signing a lease. The assignment was structured for small groups, and students rearranged chairs as needed. I listened to the student groups read the scenarios out loud and settle down to discussing possible answers and a written response. Listening to the students' discussions, I concluded they needed this topic and the chance to brainstorm. They negotiated the answer they finally wrote down. Most initial suggestions were only partly correct, and some were incorrect. The group discussion seemed to help them crystalize their responses and consider other perspectives. The teacher walked around the room and answered individual and group questions or queried students about their answers. The atmosphere stayed casual and noisy, and work was produced.

A third teacher was observed in a study skills class. Most students sat at desks working on individual homework. Two students received instruction from the teacher or the aide, one student worked on writing a paper using the computer, and another student used a calculator to finish a math worksheet. The room hummed with discussions and the sounds of chairs and bodies being readjusted. The teacher left a student she was tutoring, checked with the student at the computer, chatted with her, and offered suggestions on paragraph formation and using the spell check. Assignments of three students in the back (who were talking) were reviewed, and in a firm, quiet manner, they were reminded of their deadlines and the need for facts in their speech. A visit to the library was recommended. The work of the student with the

calculator was corrected by the aide and instruction was given to assist him. The teacher circulated among the desks and then walked back to provide more tutoring.

A fourth teacher was observed in a study skills class. He had not appeared in the Government and History classes where I went to observe him co-teaching, and this observation was unexpected. He sat at a desk, feet up on the desk top, and chatted with students. The assignment was handwritten on an overhead for the students. They were requested to read a newspaper article of their choice, write three questions on the article, and then answer the questions. Students talked at their desks, but also worked on the assignment. All students handed in an assignment. I reviewed the student papers at the end of the session. About one-third of the students appeared to have good writing and spelling skills, their questions/answers were interesting, their papers neat and easy to review. Another one-third had spelling errors (even though the words were in the article) and wrote fairly simple questions with one- or two- word answers. The remaining one-third had difficulties with the assignment in terms of writing questions, grammar, spelling, and using more than one- or two-word phrases. In addition, their penmanship was difficult to read. Answers from the teacher about grading the papers were unclear beyond "on improvement" and the task was turned over to the aide. I wondered how instruction for at least one-third of these students was implemented. I wondered why some students were in this session.

Two other areas of frustration mentioned by teachers were social skills of students and parental attitudes and levels of

information. The social skills were seen as problematic for students who were basically without many friends or supports and/or getting in trouble with the law. Descriptions of the problems were given by all teachers on more than one occasion. Some concerns were expressed as:

> He's got some real attitude problems that on the job . . . I'm not sure what will happen to him.
>
> He just needed to be "slapped in the face" before he could understand that . . . you can't steal.
>
> A student in first hour that has very few friends . . . expects a lot (of interactions and friendship) from teachers . . . gets along with younger children.
>
> They run with a crowd that definitely gets them in trouble with the law . . . maybe only 5% that would run with the crowd and . . . be able to step back from the crowd . . . if . . . faced with a choice (of) breaking the law.
>
> I can count half a dozen right now who are in trouble with the law (because of) peer pressure.
>
> This kid is so lonely . . . I'm afraid I'm graduating him to isolation.
>
> They can be real rational . . . we discuss in study skills . . . should I take this bicycle that is setting out in front of this store. They can tell you this is what I would do . . . but I couldn't honestly say I believe (they) will really do that.
>
> Oh, they'll space off and sit down on the job . . . listen to others talk and not do their work.
>
> A lot of these kids don't have the social skills to (talk or ask questions) of the supervisor.
>
> Kids that were never motivated . . . they'll come in and right away it's someone else's fault. It can never be that kid's

> fault. . . and if they are wrong they are wrong just because that's the way it is. They are looking for an excuse.
>
> He's pulling the right chains . . . because after fighting the kid for 15 minutes you figure, well, he's not causing any problems so . . . if you give 15 minutes, that's a heck of an effort.
>
> Unmotivated (kids) they just don't want to do anything . . . and blaze is they just don't care . . . and (then) kids that are interested.
>
> 50% will go the trouble way and 50% of them have enough sense to say, "No, I'm not going to do that . . . but I don't think 50% would go along if it was . . . serious, like stealing a car."

The range of descriptions and beliefs about intervening with social skills was varied. Teachers felt that, "Although it is covered in social skills and careers," it is not enough or not effective in changing student behavior. So many teachers voiced concerns and frustration with social relations/networks, that program effectiveness, outcomes, expectations, and curricula seemed an area that needed to be revisited.

Statements about students' social skills were often directly followed by statements that indicated to me that parents were seen as contributing to the problem. Some concerns expressed were: Parents question being in school if the kid isn't doing anything there; parents/family give kids everything and they don't have to work for it, and, they thus support the kid being lazy and unmotivated. Parents don't have the right information to help their kids or know how to help their kids. Some parents provide "no discipline" or think that "regardless of what their kids do, they're not doing anything wrong and . . . it wasn't their fault, someone else made them do it." Two teachers suggested a number of things they

would like to try to do to give information to parents, and all seemed quite affected by their views of parents. There may or may not be much that can be done to "fix" what teachers see as wrong, but given the energy this issue generated and drew from teachers, a discussion on perspectives for working with parents may be helpful.

Last Comments

There are many things that are not covered in this report, either, because the information we generated did not supply enough detail, or because it seemed to be an individual, isolated instance. The time we spent in the program and school was brief. It is our hope that we captured the climate and culture of the program and our expectation that we got some of it wrong and most of it right. I enjoyed my time in Ridgeview and was inspired by the deep care and concern teachers have for students. Change is happening at the high school, and teachers have a critical focus: a deep and caring concern for students. The opportunity to reflect and think through planned changes can only help this program. I feel the funding for the project and funding for change at Ridgeview High School is money pretty well spent. The outcome of the money spent is not so much in tangible and measurable outcomes as it is in opportunities for teachers and other professional staff to be heard and to reflect on their conversations in ways that will most likely support change.

To the district, administrators, teachers, and other professional staff, I would say thank you for taking the risk and

letting an outsider in for a glimpse at a program investing in quality and change. I offer my encouragement and support. It is easy to change for change sake and get lost in the process. I encourage you to take the alternate and tougher route.

Reflections on the Report

This process of consultation and reflection was as beneficial to me as it was to the teachers, instructional staff, and administrators. Follow-up discussions with the consulting teacher, special education director, and some teachers indicated that we had gotten it mostly right in our snapshot of Ridgeview. The schedules of the teachers were revised for Fall to enable a two-hour monthly team meeting. The first agenda for Fall was a team-building process. Concern regarding the non-teaching teacher was addressed and plans for him in the team process were tentatively addressed. For my part, I was amazed at how my perspectives changed. I certainly believe the district needs to either build or scrap the team idea, but starting with that was not on the original list of outcomes and processes. Given the vocational and transitional focus of the funding, and my inclinations to "get it started and in place," I would have started with the vocational teacher and her aide to increase coordination of school and nonschool work instruction, a staffing plan for implementing this, and more intense supervision on sites. In retrospect, the report revealed that staffing this change would be problematic without some more cohesive integration of the personnel at the high school. These efforts might even be ignored

and criticized to the point of reducing their impact. In addition, the perspectives that surfaced regarding families and social relationships of students became much more of a priority for me, even though these were not addressed on the initial proposal. In retrospect, it might have been better to focus on working well with families rather than on the vocational/transition process and outcomes. How involved could these families be in transitions, and how could teachers implement plans with input from students and families with these feelings about many families dragging them down?

Where to start and how to measure systems change? Each reader will most likely respond with different answers to this question for this district based on their history with the systems change and their particular professional interests and background. Systems change is tied so intimately with the complexity and culture of a district/school/program, and merely stating and measuring objective outcomes seems to ignore the influence of complexity and culture on changes. The list of objective outcomes measures (page 2) will still be used (and should be used) in the systems change process. There is some progress underway in the program. However, if only these measures were used, and if the initial self-study had not been conducted using another methodology, the deeper changes embedded in teacher reflection and decisions regarding the nature and functioning of these high school professionals as a group may have been ignored along with their profound influence on the program. The team may continue on in its same state; or with the addition of a new teacher and this

outsider's perspective, the group may move to less of an avoidance process of discussion and possibly to open sharing and problem solving. It is this decision that will then determine how much and to what extent other outcomes can be achieved. It is this decision that will in some way determine whether these outcomes will be reinforced, accepted, or ignored by the team. It is this decision that will influence the role administrators will take in the implementation of changes to enhance the program already in place.

References

Ferguson, D., Jeanchild, L., & Carter, P. J. (1991). The best tadpoles are in Room 8: Report on a school that's changing itself. Eugene: University of Oregon, Schools Project, Specialized Training Center.

Ferguson, P. M., Ferguson, D. L., & Taylor, S. J. (1992). Interpreting disability: A qualitative reader. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hill, J. W., Seyfarth, J., Banks, P. D., Wehman, P., & Orelove, F. (1987). Parent attitudes about working conditions of their adult mentally retarded sons and daughters. Exceptional Children, 54, 9-23.

Meyer, L. H., Eichinger, J., & Park-Lee, S. (1987). A validation of program quality indicators in educational services for students with severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 17, 251-263.

Putnam, J. W., & Bruininks, R. H. (1986). Future directions in deinstitutionalization and education: A Delphi investigation. Exceptional Children, 53, 55-62.

*The contributions of this author were solely in her private capacity. No official suport or endorsement by the University of Idaho is intended or should be inferred.

Dr. Diane Baumgart
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

Issues in Certification Needs

Philip R. Jones
Virginia Tech, Blacksburg

Lyndal M. Bullock
University of North Texas, Denton

Judy Smith-Davis
Outreach Alliance 2000 Project
University of New Mexico
East Desk, Fairfax Station, VA

Robert L. Ash, Superintendent
Fort Morgan, CO Public Schools

In the mid-seventies noted evangelist, Dr. Billy Graham, said: "The political process is the way we change things for the better." His remarks during a Democratic Party fund raising telethon, were preceded by Senator John Glenn's statement that "Every American is a politician whether you like it or not" (Jones, 1976).

The wave of politically-inspired education reform movements have focused on teacher and student competency as well curricular issues in the public schools. Teacher certificates, licenses, and endorsements become a focus--rightly or wrongly--when teacher competency is the concern. Teacher certification, as a state function, is usually assigned as a responsibility of the state education agency (SEA). Since education consumes significant state and local resources in every state, education falls into the realm of politics. While Dr. Graham's comment suggested change is "for the better," not all educators (or politicians) would agree that it is always the case.

Political decisions in Virginia have resulted in the requirement that initial teacher certification at the bachelor's degree level be offered only for majors in the arts and sciences. Within the arts and sciences degree, the prospective teacher is limited to 18 hours of professional education courses. The bachelor's degree in education essentially no longer exists, at least for those individuals who wish to teach in the public schools. The requirement, effective in July 1992, may or may not result in better teachers. Many Virginia educators have their doubts that students will receive a better education as politicians and policy makers envisioned when changing the degree standard. The Virginia situation is only one example of an issue in certification.

What then are the major issues in teacher certification today?

Defining the Issue

There is extensive documentation in the professional literature that highlights the critical shortage of qualified personnel to work with individuals with disabilities (e.g., NASDE, 1990; Smith-Davis, 1990; USDE, 1991). Although school districts are mandated to provide appropriate educational services, they are increasingly faced with an inability to employ qualified (and certified) staff to deliver the necessary services. Personnel shortages have "rekindled" the long standing controversy about certification in special education. The controversial issues include, but are not limited to, four major areas of concern.

1. Significance of Certification
   a. What are the most appropriate certification patterns for teachers who want to work with students with disabilities?
   b. Should there be categorical or non-categorical certification? If both have a place in the scheme of certification, for what purpose should each one be designed?
   c. Should certification be K-12, or should it be in line with elementary/secondary certification, which have grade-level groupings, such as K-8, 9-12?
2. Alternative Certification
   a. What place do "alternative" certification patterns have in the preparation of personnel to work with students with disabilities?
   b. Who should be involved in the decision-making as to the standards and requirements for "alternative" certification?
   c. What role will the institutions of higher education play in the formal course work requirements and the supervision of the field experiences?
3. Reciprocity
   a. Should there be reciprocity among states for those individuals who have completed formal special education teacher preparation programs? If so, what should be the standards to which teacher preparation programs adhere?

b. Who sets these standards and what monitoring systems must be in place to ensure compliance?

4. Turf

a. Who will recommend the issuance of certification whether acquired through traditional or alternative avenues?

Significance of the Issue of Certification

The state certification/licensure of teachers is commonly understood to be an accountability measure, rather than a means of quality control. At the same time, the certification practices of state governments (or other entities in a state) exert a strong influence over preservice teacher education. When certification requirements, regardless of their source, are seen as the entire set of qualifications and competencies necessary for personnel, the real significance of the issue becomes clear. College/universities may respond to the issue by adopting a relatively low denominator of state certification standards as the basis for training, or states may respond by issuing more and more elaborate and detailed certification requirements. The central problem appears to be the difficulty in separating the purpose served by state certification from the purpose served by training, and in separating minimum requirements from full qualifications.

The development that is expected to intervene to clarify this issue is the work of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (1991) which has been creating national standards for the teaching profession, including special education. In 1993, this

body will begin to offer advanced teacher certification, "which will complement, not replace, state systems of beginning teacher licensing" (p.8). These standards, which are developed through careful and substantive processes, should provide a new basis for differentiating between minimum compliance and full qualifications.

Significance of the Issue of Alternative Certification

A large number of states currently sponsor alternative routes to certification, whereby certain potential personnel (who usually already have baccalaureate degrees in some fields) may acquire certification/licensure through a modified preparation program that often emphasizes practical experience and places the candidate in the classroom at a relatively early stage of training. Although alternative programs typically involve the state education agency, local districts, and higher education, the balance of power varies in these arrangements. In some cases, higher education plays a predominant role in program design and supervision of field experiences; in other cases, the role of higher education is diminished. The variation among programs makes it difficult to judge the phenomenon in a global way, or to reasonably advance a blanket rejection or acceptance of alternative arrangements.

Some alternative programs have been operating for years and can demonstrate effectiveness, but many are of recent origin. While a recent premise for such training emanated from shortages of personnel (notably for math and science instruction), it is also

true that these programs represent an attempt to place greater involvement in teacher preparation in the hands of state and district-level consumers. In states where the excessive length of special education preparation programs interferes with trainee recruitment, alternative programs may seem especially attractive.

In the quest to resolve personnel shortages in special education and to deal with the issues of who controls teacher preparation, there is, however, an "alternative to alternatives" that should be considered. This is the beginning teacher, induction, or mentoring model, in which the teacher's preparation is seen as continuing through the first one or two years as a full-time practitioner in the classroom. By viewing training as having a basis in preservice but completion in practice, it is possible to ensure basic preparation in higher education and final qualifications by means of induction preparation, which intertwines the efforts of school districts and higher education personnel. Such an approach (a) responds to the recommendation of various organizations (e.g., NEA) -- that personnel preparation should be much more school-based than has been the case in the past, (b) would enable some institutions to reduce the excessive time required to complete preservice training, (c) would offer mechanisms for cooperative school district/university training, and (d) might also increase the rate of entry into the field and decrease the rate of early attrition.

The Issue of Reciprocity

That reciprocity of certification/licensure is one of the variables that influence personnel supply is illustrated in the work of the Northeast Common Market, which has created an interstate certificate as one means of expediting the deployment of personnel in this region of the United States [The Regional Laboratory of Education Improvement of the Northeast and Islands (1992, April)]. Whereas reciprocity has had some positive effect in these small, contiguous states, its impact elsewhere is less clear, because of the growing lack of mobility of teachers (Lauritzen, 1991; Nicholas, 1992). This lack of mobility is attributed to relatively low salary levels which tend to make teaching the source of a secondary, rather primary, income; thus, many teachers are not the primary wage earners in families, and their mobility is dictated by the location of the spouse (Lauritzen, 1991). The fact that the teaching profession is dominated by women underscores the assumption. Further, a large proportion of teacher education graduates tend to work within a fairly small radius of the location of their degree-granting institutions, and many are not inclined to leave urban/suburban areas, and so there is some doubt that greater reciprocity would solve recruitment problems in rural/remote school districts. The portability of pensions, seniority, and other benefits is also an important factor and may be of as much influence as certification reciprocity in propelling teachers to move.

While greater reciprocity of certification/licensure among states might expedite hires near state lines and under certain

other conditions, the propensity of teachers to transfer to other states is limited by these other factors that also need attention if personnel are to be more equitably deployed to the locations where they are needed. As is true of other decisions regarding personnel quality, supply, and demand, it is not useful to target a single variable in isolation.

The Issue of Turf or Who Controls?

The world is at a crossroads of vast political, economic, social, and technological change and is moving from one era (industrial, modern) to another (post-industrial, post-modern). A new order may be expected to emerge across fields and pursuits. There is a sense that the old methods are no longer working well, but the new approaches are not yet clear. This ambience both intensifies turf issues and makes them more difficult to interpret.

As things change (and they always do!), concerns about power and control (and their loss) become intense; and so, at one level, turf issues are about the need to maintain the status quo and its power structures. At another level, the prospect of change itself brings about resistance, because of the difficulty, inconvenience, effort, and new attitudes required by change. Change is also threatening in terms of the roles and positions that people have filled or aspired to, and in terms of the disruptive qualities of change.

All of these things are as true of special education as of many other disciplines, but are perhaps exacerbated by (a) the widening gulf among the players (e.g., state departments of education, school

districts, institutions of higher education, various professional associations, teacher unions, parents, diverging agendas within the federal government), (b) the lack of clarity about the future, and (c) the polarization of the field.

Consumer/Employer Issues

Can the public school readily find certificated teachers in all needed areas? The answer(s) to this question depend on several factors. Among them are:

1. the specific area of need (e.g., special education)
2. the geographic location of the school district
3. the ethnic/racial make-up of the school district and community
4. the pay scale, benefits, and incentives offered to the applicant
5. how easy/difficult/costly it is for applicants to become certified in the state
6. the skill level of the applicant matched with the need of the district

Therefore, the most frequent answer to the basic question is "Sometimes." The dilemma faced by the public schools is when a properly certificated and skilled applicant cannot be found. The reality of being in such a position is growing more and more common in the public schools.

Districts finding themselves in such a situation simply do the best they can, with the resources available. They hire teachers properly certified and skilled in other areas and work toward

alternative certification/endorsements; they hire more teaching assistants/paraprofessionals; they keep looking and hoping.

Districts are also creating programs to "grow their own" teachers. By working with colleges and universities, new partnerships are being developed. They are designed to assist teachers certified in other areas, and teaching assistants/ paraprofessionals who want to become teachers, to work towards proper certification in the "hard to recruit" areas. Such alternatives must be sought if public schools are going to continue to meet the growing needs of a more diverse student population. Traditional programs of the past don't need to be eliminated, but they do need to become more flexible and more creative to meet the needs of today and the future.

Alternative Solutions

This article has already addressed many alternative solutions being utilized around the country today. The motivation for most strategies to "improve" teacher certification can be traced to political interests. We are indeed fortunate that we are all politicians. If we exercise our skills as educators, we may not always be found in a reactive position.

Space has not allowed for a discussion of site-based management and its relationship to special education and teacher certification. As states and localities continue to implement varied forms of site-based management, the issues arising must be dealt with--hopefully by professional educators working with out elected state and national leaders.

Since certification can be used as an instrument to bring about or suppress change, it is not surprising that it is a current focus of attention. More important, however, is the type of system that various approaches to certification can help bring about. State certification is one means that may be used toward a particular end. The larger issue, however, is the nature and place of special education in the 21st century. If we try to deal with certification apart from this larger issue, or try to use certification to force this issue, we will probably do little more than add further twists and turns on the road from here to there.

References

Jones, P.R. (1976). The professional educator and the political process. In F.J. Weintraub, A. Abeson, J. Ballard, and M.L. LaVor (Eds.), Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Lauritzen, P. (1991). Final report of the CSPD data collection project. Whitewater, WI: University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, Department of Special Education.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) (1990, May). Liaison Bulletin, 16(4).

National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. (1991). Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession: Initial policies and perspectives of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (2nd ed.). Detroit, MI: Author.

Nicholas, G.S. (1991). Teacher supply and demand in the United States, 1991: ASCUS research report. Evanston, IL: Association for School, College, and University Staffing, Inc.

Smith-Davis, J. (1990, April). Personnel supply and demand. Proceedings of the College/University Forum Sponsored by the Georgia Department of Education, 1-15.

The Regional Laboratory of Education Improvement of the Northeast and Islands (1992, April 17). Northeast Common Market project update. Andover, MA: Author.

United States Department of Education (USDE). (1991). The Thirteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Session Two:

Children Born Affected by Drugs and Alcohol

Interventions for Infants Born Affected by Drugs and Alcohol

Marilyn Krajicek
University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
School of Nursing

Defining the Issue

The media has heightened the nation's awareness of the increase in drug use. There is concern about this increase among all socioeconomic classes, especially cocaine use by women of childbearing age (Lewis, Bennett, & Schmeder, 1989). Crack, the form of cocaine that is smoked, is short-acting, inexpensive, and widely used (Lewis et al., 1989). A major problem existing among drug abusers is that they frequently use a combination of abusing agents, which may include alcohol, cocaine, and central nervous system depressants. As a result, it is difficult to determine the specific effects of a single drug on an infant exposed to prenatal drug use. Another risk factor resulting from drug abuse is the possibility of the mother becoming infected with the HIV virus (Lewis et al., 1989). Thus the vulnerable infant is at an increasing risk for health-related behavioral and developmental problems. Characteristics that may be exhibited by the at-risk infant include: atypical motor responses, vomiting and poor sucking, irritability, inconsolability, poor muscle tone, tremors, and poor sleeping patterns. One or more of these problems can affect infant-mother bonding and lead to additional problems such as physical abuse (Lewis et al., 1989).

Understanding an infant presenting with multiple problems becomes an enormous challenge for parents, who may be in personal jeopardy, and for early childhood special educators providing intervention services. A major concern is identification of the types of intervention services that will best meet the needs of these infants.

Focus has been placed on the "differences" in children as they reach school-age. A challenge facing early service providers is whether or not a new category will be created for labeling children born to women who are substance abusers. Is there enough research data available to provide and support the answers? How different are the children who are at risk for developmental problems as a result of substance abuse from children who are at risk from other factors? According to Ira Chasnoff, a Northwestern University medical researcher who has followed 300 children since 1986, recent studies are showing that children of cocaine-using mothers are potentially within normal developmental range and have few impairments distinct from those found among children born of poverty (Viadero, 1992). His earlier studies, however, have found these children "inconsolable" and highly irritable in the newborn nursery. One study indicated that at two years of age the children had problems interacting, concentrating, and coping with an unstructured environment (Viadero, 1992, p. 10). Chasnoff's team provided parental interventions to teach mothers strategies for comforting and nurturing their children, and directing mothers to drug treatment programs (Viadero, 1992, p.10).

The most common preventable form of mental retardation is fetal alcohol syndrome. This syndrome is identified by clusters of symptoms in the following three areas: prenatal and postnatal growth retardation; characteristic facial dysmorphology; and central nervous system involvement with neurologic abnormalities and developmental and intellectual delays. In addition, there may be associated non-specific abnormalities in other body systems, including heart murmurs, septal defects, reno-genital anomalies, and skeletal malformations. Other factors interacting with the fetus include mother's health, a possible polydrug problem, poor prenatal care, poor nutrition, and a home environment that puts the infant at further risk.

Many of the interventions that have been identified for working with the infant/child with fetal alcohol syndrome are also applicable to the infant/child prenatally exposed to other drugs. Interventions should be appropriately based on individual needs and may include adequate medical and health care, good nutrition, consistent caregivers, a structured setting with clear guidelines broken down into manageable steps, age-appropriate stimulation to allow the child to achieve maximum development, encouragement and socialization at levels tolerated by the infant/child, provision for advocates for the child and family, and referral to appropriate local community resources (Krajicek, Nemec, Mazzacco, & Tighe, 1992).

Alternative Solutions

1. Focus on de-labeling. We do not need to create another category for labeling children.
2. Encourage early prenatal care. Examine the use of nurse midwives and practitioners to provide safe prenatal care to at-risk uninsured mothers.
3. Provide drug rehabilitation for parents. Continue to emphasize primary-school drug education programs.
4. Increase school-based health clinics where health services can be provided in a community setting.
5. Enhance parenting skills. Continue training of multiple disciplines in the provision of parenting skills.
6. Increased training of professionals and paraprofessionals in skills of observation, reading infant's cues, appropriate intervention strategies, and how to work with parents.
7. Prepare early childhood professionals across discipline boundaries using creative teaching strategies and interdisciplinary course offerings.
8. Provide training in behavior intervention techniques.
9. Increase the knowledge of early childhood special educators about health-related issues, such as drug interactions, genetic effects, and invasive health procedures.
10. Ongoing continuing education for professionals in all the disciplines that work with infants and toddlers. Develop skills in the use of new technologies and apply new theories to the practice setting.
11. Continue interagency collaboration and coordination.

12. Encourage professionals addressing the complex problems of early childhood special education to assist each other in serving families and keeping service systems more accountable for their interventions.
13. Prepare early childhood special educators and others to understand use assessment scales. These may include:
    a. The Brazelton Neonatal Behavioral Assessment Scale (Brazelton, 1973).
    b. Assessment of Preterm Infant's Behavior (APIB) (Als & Duffy, 1989).
    c. The Kangaroo Box Paradigm (Als & Duffy, 1989)
    d. Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment (HOME) (Caldwell & Bradley, 1984).

    Expertise in the use of assessment scales such as these provide early interventionists with tools for a more systematic Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) (Als & Duffy, 1989).
14. Caring for the caregiver, interventionist, infant, child, and family. There is a theoretical body of knowledge related to caring that needs to be explored. Watson (1985, p. 10) has identified ten caring-related factors: the formation of a humanistic-altruistic system of values; the instillation of faith-hope; the cultivation of sensitivity to one's self and to others; the development of a helping-trust relationship; the promotion and acceptance of the expression of positive and negative feelings; the systematic use of the scientific problem-solving method for decision-making; the promotion

of interpersonal teaching-learning; the provision for a supportive, protective, and (or) corrective mental, physical, socio-cultural, and spiritual environment; assistance with the gratification of human needs; and the allowance for existential-phenomenological forces.

These caring-related factors, found in the nursing literature, form a structure for studying, understanding, and applying nursing as the science of caring. However, these factors have potential applicability to early childhood special education and need to be explored. Working with infants and families who are at high risk for a number of problems is a major challenge, hard work, and often leads to a high turnover of staff and potential burnout at both the professional and para-professional level.

We, in higher education, have high expectations of our graduates. A major challenge facing us is continuing to examine and re-define curriculum content and alternative teaching strategies to better prepare the interventionists for meeting the needs of the increased complexity of issues facing each graduate.

Barriers to Obtaining the Ideal

Focusing on full implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) will continue to be a challenge due to lack of adequate funding, a major barrier. Each state must examine and define current practices, policies, and procedures for managing complex education and health care related issues, especially those related to invasive heath procedures such as

tracheostomy care, gastrostomy feeding, and other procedures necessitating a license to perform.

References

Als, H., & Duffy, F.H. (1989). Neurobehavioral assessment in the newborn period: Opportunity for early detection of later learning disabilities and early intervention. Birth Defects Original Article Series, 25(6), 127-152.

Brazelton, T.B. (1973). Neonatal behavioral assessment scale. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Caldwell, B., & Bradley, R. (1984). Observation for measurement of the environment. Little Rock, AR: Center for Child Development and Education, University of Arkansas.

Krajicek, M., Nemec, D., Mazzacco, M., & Tighe, S. (1992). Caring for children with fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal alcohol effects, (in process).

Lewis, K.D., Bennett, B., & Schmeder, N.H. (1989). The care of infants menaced by cocaine abuse. MCN The American Journal of Maternal/ Child Nursing, 14(5), 324-329.

National Standards of Nursing Practice for Early Intervention Services. (1991, January 29). Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky College of Nursing.

Viadero, D. (1992, January 29). New research finds damage suffered by "Crack" babies has been overstated. Education Week, pp. 1, 10.

Watson, J. (1985). Nursing: The philosophy and science of caring. Boulder, CO: Colorado Associated University Press.

Small Group Meetings:

Services for Children Born Affected by Drugs and Alcohol

Role of Special Education Community Relative to Children Born Affected By Drugs and Alcohol

A J. Gail Bornfield
Minot State University
Minot, North Dakota

There is a growing concern among education, mental health, medical, and social service personnel regarding children affected by drugs and alcohol. This paper reflects the result of discussion by a representative gathering of professionals from across the nation with a variety of backgrounds. The purpose of this paper is to report the outcomes of that discussion in terms of emerging trends in special education.

Defining the Issues

Since the mid-1980's, the number of children prenatally exposed to drugs and alcohol has grown. A frequently cited statistic is that 11% of all babies born are exposed to drugs (NASDE, 1992). Professionals in education, health and social services are concerned about programming for these children. Concerns raised at the forum by participants include medical, political and educational areas.

The first concern is that these children cannot legally be identified at birth without parental consent. As a result of this, many of these children go undiagnosed, resulting in no services. Many of the parents are polydrug users. Drugs often include legal medications and alcohol. The use of these drugs, including alcohol, can cause brain damage in the fetus, resulting in neurological and/or cognitive impairment.

Medical concerns were raised, not only in relation to the infant, but, also, involving the family unit. The parent's addictions continue after the birth of a child. They go unidentified and untreated in many cases. Parents are not likely to admit to an addiction problem because of legal ramifications. In severe cases, infants are left at the hospital and become "border babies". They ultimately end up in the foster care system.

Political concerns discussed included the increasing population and funding issues. Concern was expressed regarding attitudes toward children identified as prenatally exposed, i.e., fear of behaviors they may present. Family issues were raised regarding continuing parental problems (addiction, abuse, neglect) and family dysfunction.

Another political issue is that presently prenatal exposure is not legally recognized as a disability. In order to receive services, children must be served through established categories, such as LD, EH, or Other Health Impaired. Personnel prepared to teach in these categorical areas were not and are not receiving training to assist them in working with the complex behaviors presented by these students. There is also a question regarding eligibility under 504 regulations. Unfortunately, no funding is provided under this regulation. There is presently no special funding identified specifically for these students.

Educational concerns revolve around the fact that no lead agency or department has been established to assume the leadership role. As a result, no line of responsibility has been established within school systems either in administrative or

service directed areas. Perhaps, as a result, training for personnel has not been available at either the inservice or preservice levels. It is evident that traditional methods are not effective with many of these students. Another major concern is that teacher's roles and responsibilities have not been defined.

Recommendations

The first recommendation is to look at prevention. Three main areas were identified:

1. Incorporate information on the effects of the use of drugs and/or alcohol during pregnancy into sex education curricula. This should begin during the elementary school years. There was an expressed feeling among participants that middle school would be too late for some students to receive this information.

2. Enlist the assistance of the Surgeon General's office to get information to the public, particularly young students.

3. Target second-time parents for information programs.

Educational recommendations called for allocating responsibility for programming, at least within the educational system. Teachers, related services personnel and other direct service staff need to have delineated role responsibilities. For example, therapists should serve as consultants to teachers using an integrated model. Appropriate training and inservice need to be provided to all staff.

The greater community (mental health, child protective services, juvenile courts, developmental disabilities) should unite using an interagency council to establish procedures and stimulate

cooperation on services for these students. Awareness activities need to be conducted in the community, such as expanding Child Find activities to include this population.

SEAs should shift federal dollars to capacity building and use state dollars to provide direct services. LEAs and IHEs should form partnerships to drive training and strategies. Alternative teaching strategies and behavioral management techniques should be developed through this type of cooperation. These new strategies and techniques should then be validated through research.

The primary recommendation in the political area is to form a national task force. The task force would be responsible for collecting information from around the nation and sharing the results and recommendations with congressional bodies in order to gain funding and support that is desperately needed in order to serve this population of children and their families.

There is also a need to recognize alcohol as a drug. There are barriers to this in the form of strong congressional lobbies from the alcohol and tobacco industry. However, the effects of alcohol and tobacco use on fetus development during pregnancy need to be publicized to all groups in our society.

Special Education's Role

Group participants expressed that special education should serve in a catalytic leadership role at national, state and local levels. As leaders, the role of incarceration of juveniles who are addicted and the legal consequences for mothers who have given

birth to an effected infant need immediate examination. Perhaps, a treatment model would better serve all the victims!

Special education should also assume responsibility for facilitating services and promoting research. Advocacy is another role for the special educator. As advocates, we need to insist upon broader community and media support in information dissemination and service provision.

Many questions regarding the population of prenatally exposed children remain to be answered:

1. What prevalence rates can be expected in the future? With prevention activities? Without prevention activities?
2. What outcomes can be expected? With programming? Without programing?
3. What will be the ultimate expense in serving this population?

With programming? Without programming?

References

NASDE Staff. (1992, January). Children exposed in utero to illegal drugs: Education's newest crisis. Liason Bulletin, 1-5.

Examination of Issues Related to In-service Programming for Personnel Working with Children Who are Prenatally Exposed to Drugs and Alcohol

Lyndal M. Bullock
Regent's Professor, Special Education
University of North Texas
Denton, Texas

Nona Flynn
Director, Parent Advocacy Center
McLean, VA

Jackie Mault
Director, Special Services
Toppenish School District
White Swan, Washington

Lana Svien
Assistant Professor, Physical Therapy Program
USD School of Medicine
Vermillion, South Dakota

It has been estimated that two out of every 1000 babies are born with disabilities because of maternal consumption of alcohol (Plummer & Avery, 1990). Many researchers believe these estimates to be significantly underrepresentative of the magnitude of the problem. Often, it has been found that prenatally substance exposed children do not come to the attention of professionals at birth (Heflin, 1992). This belief is reinforced by data from the Office of Inspector General (1990), which indicated that about 80% of the children affected will not be identified until they reach the age of two or three, and maybe not until school-age.

The America 2000 Initiative offered by the U. S. Department of Education proposes as Goal 1, a focus on ensuring that all

children begin school ready to learn. This goal is particularly important when talking about children who have been prenatally exposed to drugs and alcohol, in part because the early years are critical to a young child's future development. The specific objectives related to implementation of this goal also hold promise for ensuring the future of these and other children in that they suggest that all children who are disadvantaged and disabled have access to high quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs. Another objective relates to a commitment to parents (guardians) and their involvement in the educational process, including needed training and support provisions. A third objective calls for children to receive the nutrition and health care that they need.

Although our current procedures fail to provide highly reliable data on the numbers of children being affected by prenatal exposure to drugs and alcohol, there is evidence that there are large numbers of children who are in our communities and schools whose disabilities may be attributed to these unfavorable prenatal conditions.

Because we have only recently recognized the seriousness of the problems presented by many children who have been prenatally exposed to drugs and alcohol, there has been little emphasis in the formal training programs of direct service providers on how to meet the unique needs that these children present. If service providers are to be able to meet the daily challenges presented by these children (and their families), it is important that they be given the opportunities to increase their knowledge, skills, and

understanding of how to effectively and efficiently meet these challenges. One of the most effective ways to provide new information to large groups of professionals (and paraprofessionals) is through in-service programming. It is, therefore, the intent of this paper to: (a) further define the issue, (b) delineate some solutions for consideration, and (c) highlight some of the obstacles and barriers that exist related to in-service programs designed for service providers of children who have been prenatally exposed to drugs and alcohol.

Defining the Issue

The primary issue with regard to providing services for children affected by prenatal exposure to drugs and alcohol revolves around several questions:

1. Is it possible to determine which individuals and services are likely to come in contact with these young children in order to facilitate early identification of problems? If so, could in-service strategies be targeted to those individuals and services?

2. What do direct service providers (e.g., medical and other related service personnel, teachers) need to know in order to appropriately serve these children? Is it important for them to have information on effective interdisciplinary collaboration techniques? How can the in-service model reflect a family-centered approach?

3. Who are those that need this in-service? Do local school personnel, as well as community agency personnel, need in-service?

4. How can local Interagency Coordinating Councils (ICC) be strengthened to meet the needs of children who reside in families affected by substance abuse?

5. In order for in-service to be effective at the local level, do the programs need to be developed from "within" the community? If so, how can a framework or system be developed that will make the efforts effective and efficient?

6. How will in-service be presented? What models are available that are tailored to meet the unique needs of the adult learner? Do we need to develop new in-service models?

In giving consideration to the above-mentioned questions, any ideas generated must revolve around the development of partnerships with parents and the unique resources available in the community where the services are to be provided. Another issue that is critical in the early planning stages relates to how the funding of in-service programs is to be determined and coordinated among the various community agencies. It is reasonable to assume, given the nature of the in-service training to be delivered, that a wide variety of funding sources will need to be identified and utilized. These may include federal, state, and local community dollars. The financial support will, most likely, come from monies currently available to examine current issues related to drug and alcohol use, as well as other funds designated for education and training.

Alternative Solutions

As service providers seek solutions to the problems presented by children who are affected by drugs and alcohol, it is important to focus on the community. The community must be considered as the pivotal point for planning and development of any prevention/intervention services. Input must be obtained from as broad a cross-sampling of the community as possible. This would, at minimal, include parents, schools, community-based agencies (e.g., day care, mental health), businesses, churches, and other community-based service organizations. While schools will be charged with addressing the educational needs of children affected by substance use, the community-generated ideas are likely to better address the more global areas of concern, including family issues, social/emotional development, and transitional planning. Community involvement in all stages of the prevention/intervention effort will help ensure support for the programs as they are developed and implemented.

At the community level, it is suggested that the local ICC be strengthened and broadened to address all needs of children, and not be limited to the 0-3 age population. This is important because, as these children grow older, there must be a planned and coordinated effort in place to ensure the continuation of appropriate services.

Schools should be encouraged to look to the business arena for "team building" models that are effective. The business world has been involved in team building for many years and may have models or strategies that could be effectively applied to education. As we

educators become more involved in cross-disciplinary activities, we recognize a need to explore, accept, develop, adapt, and adopt mechanisms that will enable us to be more effective community participants. As we identify models that work, dissemination of these models would greatly enhance the field.

When planning in-service programs, two topics are considered essential. The first topic is "collaboration." Educators seldom receive formal preparation on how to be effective collaborators (and communicators). In order to become effective participants in a cross-disciplinary service delivery system or a system that needs to be interactive with the community, collaboration skills are critical.

The second important in-service topic is "improving partnerships with parents". If educators hope to solicit input from parents in the community, they must involve them more effectively in a partnership relationship. Although we give a great deal of lip service to the importance of parents, we often fail miserably in actively involving them in the education of their children. Hopefully, as educators, we are beginning to recognize and acknowledge our inability to "do it all" and are becoming more willing to reach out to parents (and families) and other significant helpers within the community.

In-service programs may become more generic in nature as the result of community-agency input. In-service programs may also utilize local resources that are not presently being fully tapped. Once community collaboration develops, it could be expected that more private and public resources will become

available to the schools. As these community partnerships emerge, it is likely that the in-service programs of the future will be quite different from those of the present.

In planning in-service programs, much attention is focused on the desired outcomes, content, presentation methods, and who will be involved in the activity. While these things are important, in-service planners must not overlook the evaluation component. Any in-service plans which are implemented should provide for systematic follow-up to measure the effectiveness and efficiency in addressing the targeted outcomes. As communities become more involved in a collaborative effort, more individuals, agencies, and institutions will be interested in whether the in-service has been effective in improving the status of schools, staff, professionals, and children. Positive outcome data will likely ensure continued personal and financial support of the community.

Obstacles and Barriers

In this section, major obstacles or barriers have been identified and briefly addressed. These include the need to: (a) face a new and difficult challenge, (b) recognize the interagency and interdisciplinary nature of in-service training, (c) recognize that new paradigms for in-service training are required, and (d) move away from stigmatizing labels.

Facing a New and Difficult Challenge

Many school systems are still playing the avoidance game, hoping that the issue of providing services to children who have been prenatally substance exposed will disappear before they have

to openly address the concern. Educational decision-makers often selectively read parts of articles that stress that the children prenatally exposed to drugs and alcohol are not a new kind of children. Instead, they focus on the fact that as infants many of these children show no early signs of developmental delay - a fact which is undeniably true, while failing to follow ongoing research studies that indicate a dramatic increase in learning and social/emotional problems as these children begin to reach school-age.

It must be recognized that crack/cocaine has had a dramatic impact upon early intervention programs. As professionals, we face a new set of problems--different and unique from what we have experienced previously--while at the same time we face a shortage of funding and other resources needed in order to deal with young victims of the drug epidemic.

The number of cocaine-exposed children has changed many human service positions and placed new responsibilities on the service providers in order to try to meet the needs of children. Because substance-abusing parents tend to be unstable, major issues such as basic survival needs--food, shelter, and safety, and parenting ability, become important elements in the intervention/treatment programs for children. Protective service referrals and foster care placements are also important components.

A tidal wave of children who have been substance exposed and their families are converging on the school systems. The facts can no longer be ignored. Many children will require special education

services and related services in and out of the regular classrooms. Facing this new and difficult challenge is a significant barrier to overcome.

Interagency and Interdisciplinary Nature of In-service Training

The very nature of the problem being addressed in this paper necessitates interagency collaboration. All service providers dealing with these children should have specialized information related to how to work with child protective services, social service agencies, corrections, drug and alcohol treatment programs, educators, as well as health and mental health professionals. Knowledge and understanding of the roles/responsibilities of other helping professionals facilitate each of our abilities to work effectively with each other. In-service training should be a community commitment with educators learning with and from their co-workers in human services. New ways to cooperatively share and learn must be explored without further delay.

New Paradigm for In-service Required.

Change is never easy. As educators, we must recognize the new challenges that are before us. In a recent issue of Infant-Toddler Intervention, Lesar (1992) highlighted some of the challenges we face:

> Service delivery programs must allow for ongoing supervision, consultation, and peer support so that problems, feelings, and particularly troublesome treatment issues can be shared. Staff support methods, including monitoring caseloads,

> respecting feelings of the ineffectiveness, and (ongoing) staff education are essential to prevent burnout and turnover.
>
> Working with families introduces problems and issues most teachers will not have faced. Special training and support will be needed to work through prejudice, negative attitudes and to approach parents with positive and helpful suggestions and assistance. (p. 49)

Stigmatizing by the Need to Label

The labeling of children prenatally exposed to drugs and alcohol is a major issue that must be addressed. Are educators to be trained to teach children who are pervasively developmentally delayed, or who have attention-deficit disorders, or who are substance exposed, or "crack kids"? Is it necessary that these children be categorized or labeled? It is hoped that the majority of the children will be educated in regular classrooms with special assistance when it is warranted. Children prenatally exposed to drugs and alcohol do not all have the same characteristics. The individual needs of children must be addressed and teachers provided with training to deal effectively with a wide variety of behaviors and learning requirements.

Concluding Statements

Service providers are being faced with new and difficult challenges. Many of the "tried and proven" methods of the past are not effective with children prenatally exposed to drugs and alcohol. The challenges call for a new way of "doing business;" the challenges require collaborative efforts among all community service providers as we seek more productive ways of providing effective services to children and their families. In-service

planning, development, and implementation are mechanisms to ensure that service providers receive new information and learn how to work together for the good of America's children.

References

Heflin, J. (1992). Behavioral characteristics of young children who were prenatally substance exposed. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton.

Lesar, S. (1992, March). Prenatal cocaine exposure: The challenge to education. Infant-Toddler Intervention, 2, 49.

Office of Inspector General. (1990). Crack babies. (DHHS Publication No. OEI-03-89-01540). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Plummer, W., & Avery, S. (1990, April). Children in peril. People Weekly, 82-85.

A special thanks is given to Amy Bennett, Education Program Specialist, OSEP/Division of Educational Services for her contributions to this manuscript.

Perspectives on Research in Alcohol and Drug Abuse as it Relates to Special Education and Personnel Preparation

Robert E. Crow
Human Development Center
School of Allied Health Professions
LSU Medical Center

Among the negative impacts of alcohol and drug abuse on our society are the stresses and challenges presented to our educational systems. For local education agencies, the effects of substance abuse appear in forms of behavioral deficits or excesses by students and frustrations shown by teachers and administrators. At the same time, higher education is being pressed to prepare teachers and leadership personnel so that they are better equipped to provide top quality educational experiences for our children. The negative contributions of alcohol and drug abuse to the already complicated challenges faced by our education establishment are being increasingly recognized and deserve direct attention.

In recognition of these issues a "Small Group on Research Needs in Topics of Persons Affected by Alcohol or Drug Abuse" met during the "Forum on Emerging Trends in Special Education: Implications for Training Personnel," Washington, D.C., April 1992. The actions of this small, structured focus group are reported here with points of consideration provided by the author.

Defining the Issue

This Small Group was comprised of eleven professionals holding degrees in special education or related disciplines. Most

group members were employed in higher-education teacher preparation programs, but one was an OSEP official, and two were in leadership positions in University Affiliated Programs. All were named to the Small Group by organizers of the Forum.

In a period of about two hours, the group engaged in discussion on the topic and completed a brief survey instrument regarding their perception of needs for research in issues of alcohol and drug abuse. Discussion was guided by a "Topical Discussion Guide sheet" that contained three main sections, (a) Defining the Issue, (b) Alternative (Ideal) Solutions, and (c) Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal. Each of these sections was further divided into subsections, for example, "Extent and Severity of the Problem," "Behavioral and Social Aspects of the Problem," "Strategies for Progress," and other subsections. The Facilitator used the subsections as prompts to stimulate discussion about research issues.

Procedures for Discussion and Findings

Discussion was facilitated by the Group Leader, with reference to the Guide sheet. This person, and an assigned Recorder, kept contemporaneous notes of the comments of participants. All participants, including the Facilitator and Recorder, provided input on each category of discussion. Every few minutes the Facilitator offered a question or directed attention to headings on the Guide sheet to keep comments on topic and progressing through the identified points.

Five themes that emerged during group discussion are listed below. Under these thematic headings are relevant, paraphrased comments of the participants, as indicated in the two sets of notes and, in part, recalled by the Facilitator.

Theme One: Prevention and Drug Education Must Be Put Into High Gear.

a. We see many and expect to see even more children affected by alcohol and drug abuse; the job is overwhelming.
b. Mothers are giving birth to multiple problem babies.
c. Somebody needs to get "upstream" and stop this flow of problems.
d. Are we [educators] in the "business" of prevention? Who is?
e. The nature and extent of this problem need to be recognized and solutions supported by the general public and policy makers.

Theme Two: Systems-Change Efforts, Including Incentives for Manpower Development and Retention, Should be Acted On with a High Priority.

a. A systematic approach to problems of alcohol and drug abuse is lacking; lacking definition, focus, and leadership.
b. The picture is terribly confounded and includes factors of poverty, family structure, nutrition, etc.
c. Educational systems need to be financed on the basis of children's needs, not labels applied to them.

d. Higher education must be more actively and functionally involved, but that system does not support or reward this type of community-based involvement.

Theme Three: Special Education Should Do What it Does Well - Change And Not Be Distracted.

a. Our human resources are stretched too thin already, we are not equipped to direct major efforts to this problem.
b. Educators should be doing what they know how to do, that is, "change behavior," not be forced into being drug counselors.
c. We must avoid the "medical model road."
d. We need more information about how to use the educational methods we now have with different students.

Theme Four: The Major Functional Features of Early Intervention Should be Utilized to Guide Refinements in Much of Special Education.

a. Early intervention demonstrates the utility and effectiveness of functionality, community-referenced, family-focused, and other practices that should be "pervasive" in education.
b. Intervening as early as possible is where to "invest."

Theme Five: Meaningful Research and Dissemination are Needed in Topics of Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

a. We don't have a handle on the problem partly because researchers aren't looking at what special educators need.

b. Research emphasis should go toward identifying effective interventions and quality indicators.
c. Researchers should inform special educators about what's coming so we have the opportunity to plan.
d. There should be RFPs for "crack students" and "effective education."
e. Researchers aren't asking or answering the right questions.
f. Studies need to help with assigning responsibilities among disciplines and treatment models; special education doesn't have to do everything.

The five themes were described by the Facilitator to the Small Group near the end of the meeting period. The membership was asked about their agreement, and all concurred that these statements accurately reflect the deliberations of the group.

Procedures for Identifying Research Needs and Priorities. In the last few minutes of the two hours allotted for this Small Group meeting, the Facilitator distributed a Research Needs Priority Rating Worksheet. This form listed 57 topics related to alcohol and drug abuse in which research could be done. The topics were grouped under the headings used to guide discussion, that is, Defining the Issue, Alternative (Ideal) Solutions, and Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal.

To the right of each topic were the numbers 1 ("LOW") through 5 ("HIGH") which could be circled by the responder to indicate their rating of the topic. Participants were asked to read the instructions contained on the form and enter their ratings. The

forms were collected as the participants left the room. Subsequently, the mean, range, and standard deviation were determined for the accumulated ratings. Table 1 contains the 10 top-ranked research topics grouped under the heading "Defining the Issue" and the mean rating for each.

Table 1

The top 10 of 26 research topics related to "Defining the Issue"

Rank	Research Topic	Mean Rating
1.	Impact on learning and memory	4.70
2.	Validation of treatments	4.70
3.	Social/interpersonal dynamics in abuse	4.10
4.	Methods for interpersonal support	4.10
5.	Consumer involvement in dissemination	4.10
6.	Behavior change processes associated with abuse and treatment	4.09
7.	Social/societal impact of A & D abuse	4.00
8.	Effects on abuser's behavior	4.00
9.	Interpersonal approaches to treatment	4.00
10.	Incentives for being free of drug	3.90

Alternative Solutions

The second section on the "Research Needs Priority Rating Worksheet form was used to obtain ratings of research topics related to "Alternative (Ideal) Solutions" to problems of alcohol or drug abuse. These data are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

The top 10 of 24 research topics related to "Alternative Solutions"

Rank	Research Topic	Mean Rating
1.	Family-focused intervention methods	5.00
2.	Staffing and staff training	4.73
3.	Interagency models for treatment (S)	4.70
4.	Treatment methods (C)	4.60
5.	Staff training (C)	4.60
6.	Approaches to prevention (N)	4.60
7.	Early intervention/treatment (I)	4.55
8.	Awareness and public education (I)	4.44
9.	Interagency approaches to prevention (S)	4.40
10.	Interagency treatment models (C)	4.33

Note: I, C, S, and N indicate topics at the Individual, Community, Service Systems, or National level, respectively.

Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal

The third portion of the discussion guide sheet and the research needs rating form contained headings and topics related to considerations in reaching solutions to the problems of alcohol and drug abuse. Several of the discussion points listed with the "themes" are noticeable in this regard. Also, direct ratings of seven researchable topics were obtained as described above. These ratings are reported in Table 3.

Table 3

The rankings for the 7 research topics related to "Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal"

Rank	Research Topic	Mean Rating
1.	Wider use of individual/single subject research methods	5.00
2.	Funding decision-making	4.00
3.	Policy development	3.89
4.	Application of qualitative research methods	3.78
5.	Wider use of ethnographic and case study methods	3.56
6.	Improved population/group research methods	3.44
7	Leadership enhancement	3.22

Considerations Related to Group Discussion and Ratings. The collected comments of the group members can be taken as indicative of great regard and concern for the well being of students served by our systems of special education. From this perspective, the themes and ratings reported above can be seen as internally consistent. For example, concerns for attending to the business special educators know, learning how to do it better, and calling for constructive systems change, each and collectively demonstrate a commitment to effective interventions for students with special needs.

At the same time, the responses of the group members show frustration with what appears to be an expansion in the role of special education into such matters as preventing drug use, counseling students who abuse drugs, supporting teenage mothers with drug affected babies, and community outreach to build support for drug-related programs. While important services for our citizens, it was the consensus of this group that special educators are not particularly prepared for these roles and may not desire them. In turn, teacher training programs are neither well prepared, nor apparently expected, to instruct special educators in how to be drug interventionists.

These observations suggest the need for constructive review and adjustment of the systems and functional services that are available for our student populations. This important effort may be seen as a large, problem-solving endeavor which should benefit from an appropriate database, that is, empirical studies of

alternative solutions. Each aspect of the system, and our practices, should benefit from a foundation of relevant research.

The data and discussion presented in this paper underscore the value and need for well-considered investigations in topics of alcohol and drug abuse. That these studies need to be directed toward both assisting with systems change and identifying effective interventions is noticeable. Also suggested is expanded consumer involvement in research, a point that is an essential feature of "A Dissemination Policy for Disability and Rehabilitation Research in the Nineties" issued by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (undated). Furthermore, there is clear support for the use of additional research designs and the conduct of studies targeted to the needs of special educators for effective intervention methods. These suggestions are very compatible with the call for conducting relevant research provided by Phil Strain (1988) when he advised us about "separating the winners from the losers." Apparently, this advice is still good.

References

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (undated). A dissemination policy for disability and rehabilitation research for the nineties. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Strain, P. (1988). The evaluation of early intervention research: Separating the winners from the losers. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 12(2), 182-190.

Author Note

Appreciation is extended to the members of the Small Group for their participation, and to the DPP/OSEP and University of Northern Colorado for co-sponsoring the Emerging Trends Conference and this small group opportunity.

Copies of the "Topical Discussion Guide sheet" and the "Research Needs Priority Rating Sheet" are available by request to Dr. Robert E. Crow, Director, Human Development Center, School of Allied Health Professions, LSUMC, 1100 Florida Ave., New Orleans, LA 70119.

Participants

Leonard Albright
Department of Occupational Studies
California State University - Long Beach
Long Beach, CA 90840

Carmen Arrega-Mayer
Juniper Gardens Children's Project
1614 Washington Blvd.
Kansas City, KS 66102

Robert L. Ash
Superintendent
Morgan County School District, RE-3
230 Walnut Street
Ft. Morgan, CO 80701

Betty Baker
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Diane Baumgart
University of Idaho
Dept of Counseling & Special Education
Moscow, ID 83843

Tom Behrens
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Amy Bennett
U.S. Department of Education
Division of Education Services
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Felix Billingsly
University of Washington
816 N.E. 92nd
Seattle, WA 98115

Joan Kay Blaska
St. Cloud State University
Education Bldg. B130
St. Cloud, MI 56301-449

Don Blodgett
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Martha Bokee
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

A.J. Gail Bornfield
Department of Special Education
Minot State University
Minot, ND 58701

Martha R. Bryan
U.S. Department of Education
Division of Education Services
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Lyndal M. Bullock
University of North Texas
Programs in Special Education
P.O. Box 13857
Denton, TX 76203

Teresa Bunsen
University of Northern Colorado
Division of Special Education
McKee Hall 318
Greeley, CO 80639

Donna M. Burgess
University of Washington
EEU/CDMRC, WJ-10
Seattle, WA 98195

Kyle Carter
President, Research Corporation
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, CO 80639

Patricia Thomas Cegelka
San Diego State University
4280 Caminito Pintoresco
San Diego, CA 92108

Dick Champion
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Phil Chinn
19600 Terraza Terrace
Walnut, CA 91787

R. Brian Cobb
Colorado State University
209 Education Building
Ft. Collins, CO 80523

Sally Conlon
U.S. Department of Education
Division of Education Services
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Lynn Cook
NASDSE
Clearinghouse on Professions
1800 Diagonal, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314

Carolyn S. Cooper
Eastern Illinois University
Department of Special Education
Charleston, IL 61920

Robert E. Crow
Director, Human Development Center
LSU Medical Center
1100 Florida Avenue, Bldg. 138
New Orleans, LA 70119

Robert Davila
Asst. Secretary Department of Education
Division of Education Services
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Smokie Davis
NASDSE
Assistant Director
1800 Diagonal, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314

Mary Delaney
St. Mary School for the Deaf
2253 Main Street
Buffalo, NY 14214

Marty Demetras
Arizona UAP
Northern Arizona University
P.O. Box 5630
Flagstaff, AZ 86011

Roberta DePompei
University of Akron
Schol of Communicative Disorders
West Hall
Akron, OH 44325-300

Jean K. Elder
Performance Learning Systems, Inc.
31000 Northwestern Highway
Suite 200
Farmington Hills, MI 48334

Leigh A. Elizondo
Education Specialist
P.O. Box 863
Houston, TX 77001-086

Susan Elting
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

Vance Engleman
Options International
303 Peebles
Sewickley, PA 15143

Norma J. Ewing
University of Illinois - Carbondale
Chairperson
1004 Schwartz Street
Carbondale, IL 62901

Vilma T. Falck
University of Texas
School of Public Health
P.O. Box 20186, 2805 Bissonnet
Houston, TX 77225

Peter Fanning
Clinical and Community Programs
The Kennedy Institute
707 North Broadway
Baltimore, MD 21205

Joseph M. Ferrara
North Dakota Center for Disabilities
500 University Avenue, N.W.
Minot, ND 58701

Kay Ferrell
University of Northern Colorado
Division of Special Education
McKee 318
Greeley, CO 80639

Nona Flynn
Parent Education Advocacy Center
Director
1252 Daleview Drive
McLean, VA 22102

Robert Fuchigami
Sonoma State University
442 Garfield Park
Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Connie Garner
U.S. Department of Education
Division of Education Services
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dean C. Garstecki
Northwestern University
2299 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208-355

Bob Gilmore
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

LaVerne Graves
Creative Concepts, Inc.
206 Westwood Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Sally Hamburg
Project Coordinator
Indiana Special Education Mediation Services
833 Northside Blvd.; Bldg #1-Rear
South Bend, IN 46617

Rhona Hartman
HEATH Resource Center
One Dupont Circle, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036-119

Gail Houle
U.S. Department of Education
Division of Education Services
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Norm Howe
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Allen M. Huang
Division of Special Education
University of Northern Colorado
McKee 318
Greeley, CO 80639

Kathleen M. Huebner
American Foundation f/t Blind
15 W. 16th Street
New York, NY 10011

Philip R. Jones
Virginia Tech
206 E. Eggleston Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061-030

William Jones
American Assoc. of University Affiliates
Programs or Persons with D.D.
8630 Fenton Street, Suite 410
Silver Springs, MD 20910

John Kincheloe
Dean, College of Education & Human Services
Minot State University
Minot, ND 58707

Frank King
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mark A. Koorland
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Marilyn Krajicek
University of Colorado - Denver
Health Sciences Center, School of Nursing,
4200 East 9th Avenue
Denver, CO 80262

Ned Levine
Tucson Unified School District
650 North Igo Way
Tucson, AZ 85710

Harvey Liebergott
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Herman Lujan
President, University of Northern Colorado
Carter Hall
Greeley, CO 80639

Ann Lynch
Humana Hospital
4305 Fortune
Las Vegas, NV 89109

Payne Mario
HEATH Resource Center
One Dupont Circle, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036-119

Alma McPhearson
Arlington Department of Human Services
1906 "C" Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Celane McWhorter
T.A.S.H.
1600 Price Street, Suite 115
Alexandria, VA 22308

Shitla P. Mishra
University of Arizona
Chair, Dept. of Educationa Psychology
Education Building, Room 602
Tucson, AZ 85721

Ed Moore
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Robert Moulton
Box 10076 Union Station
Beaumont, TX 77710

Max Mueller
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Karl Murray
Council of Exceptional Children
CSPD Project Director
1800 Diagonal, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314

John A. Nesbitt
Professor Emeritus
University of Iowa
362 Koser
Iowa City, IA 57746-303

Glenda J. Oschner
University of Oklahoma
825 N.E. 14th
P.O. Box 26901
Oklahoma City, OK 13190

Gloria M. Palma
Department of HPER
North Carolina A&T State University
East Market Street
Greensboro, NC 27411

Linda Parmar
National Technical Institute for the Deaf
One Lomb Memorial Drive
Bldg 60, Room 3139
Rochester, NY 14623

Linda A. Patriarca
Michigan State University
College of Education
339 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-103

Reece L. Peterson
University of Nebraska - Lincoln
202A Barkley Center
Lincoln, NE 68583

Bruce Ramirez
Council of Exceptional Children
Assistant Executive Director
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

Steve Ramsey
Weakley County Schools
Room 309 Courthouse
Dresden, TN 38225

Charlotte Royeen
412 Ole Dirt Road
Great Falls, VA 22066-420

Chauncy N. Rucker
University of Connecticut
Special Education, Tech Lab, U-64
249 Glenbrook Road
Storrs, CT 06269-206

Richard C. Schofer
P.O. Box 3377
Estes Park, CO 80517

Jane Scura
772 Blossom Road
Rochester, NY 14610

Judy Shragg
U.S. Department of Education
Director, OSEP
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Judy Smith-Davis
10860 Hampton Road, East Desk
Fairfax Station, VA 22039

Elizabeth Spiers
HEATH Resource Center
One Dupont Circle, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036-119

Doris Sutherland
3800 Powell Lane, #701
Fall Church, VA 22041

Lana Svien-Senne
USD School of Medicine
320 South University Street
Vermillion, SD 57069

Angele M. Thomas
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Jack Tringo
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

James A. Tucker
Bureau of Special Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126

John Umbreit
University of Arizona
Dept. of Special Education and Rehab.
Tucson, AZ 85721

Carol Valdevieso
NICHCY
Director
Box 1492
Washington, D.C. 20013

Eva Vazquez-Nutall
CRS Department
Northeastern University
212 Lake Hall
Boston, MA 02115

Maria E. Velarde Bove
12 Stove Ridge Drive
Rutland, VT 05021

Jackie Walker-Mault
Toppenish Public School District
P.O. Box 518, 106 Franklin Avenue
White Swan, WA 98948

Vicky Ware
U.S. Department of Education
Department of Personnel Preparation
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Francine White
Gallaudet University
800 Florida Avenue, N.E.
Fowler Hall
Washington, D.C. 20002

This monograph was partially supported by grant No. H020K20061, funded through the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. Principal investigators for the grant project are Teresa D. Bunsen and Lewis B. Jackson.

A special thanks goes to Susan J. Robinson and Robin D. Brewer for compilation and proofreading of the materials